

D.C. 20005, (202) 624-0892. A copy of the proposed consent decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy of the Decree, please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$19.50 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library. For a copy of the Decree with all of the attachments (Record of Decision for Operable Unit One, Statement of Work, and Site Map), please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$37.50 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library. Joel Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,
Environment and Natural Resources Division.
[FR Doc. 96-6613 Filed 3-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Notice of Lodging a De Minimis Settlement By Consent Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)

Notice is hereby given that on February 12, 1996, a proposed consent decree in *United States versus Fidelcor Business Credit Corp., et al.*, Civ. A. No. 93-CV-0233, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. This settlement is a *de minimis* settlement with the current owners and current lessee of the Eddystone Avenue Superfund Site, located in Eddystone, Pennsylvania. The current owners are Salvatore and Ruby Finocchiaro and the current lessee is R.F. Trucking, Inc. The *de minimis* settlement in this matter is pursuant to Section 122(g)(1)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99-499, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9622, and requires the Settlers to pay \$2,970.00 in past response costs to the United States and provide access to the Site to EPA. The Decree reserves the right of the United States to seek further injunctive relief should the Settlers fail to meet the requirements of the Decree and to seek recovery of costs associated with damage to natural resources.

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 of the Environment and Natural Resources

Division, Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044, and should refer to *United States versus Fidelcor Business Credit Corp., et al.*, DOJ Reference No. 90-11-3-956.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 651 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Region III Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 841 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 "G" Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202)624-0892. A copy of the proposed decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library at the address listed above. In requesting a copy, please refer to the referenced case and number, and enclose a check in the amount of \$4.50 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,
Environment and Natural Resources Division.
[FR Doc. 96-6614 Filed 3-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Registration

By Notice dated October 24, 1995, and published in the Federal Register on November 8, 1995, (60 FR 56354), Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, New Jersey 07110, made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of levorphanol (9220), a basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedule II.

No comments or objections have been received. DEA has considered the factors in Title 21, United States Code, Section 823(a) and determined that the registration of Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc. to manufacture levorphanol is consistent with the public interest and with United States obligations under international treaties, conventions, or protocols in effect on May 1, 1971, at this time. Therefore, pursuant to Section 303 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 and Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 1301.54(e), the Deputy Assistance Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, hereby orders that the application submitted by the above firm for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic class of controlled substance listed above is granted.

Dated: March 11, 1996.

Gene R. Haislip,

Deputy Assistance Administrator, Office of
Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement
Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-6692 Filed 3-19-96;8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

Immigration and Naturalization Service

[INS No. 1749-96]

RIN 1115-AE28

Renewal of Immigration and Naturalization Service Citizens' Advisory Panel

AGENCY: Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, Sections 1-14, and Title 41 CFR sections 101-6.1001-6.1035, the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), with the concurrence of the Attorney General, is renewing, for a 2-year period, the Citizens' Advisory Panel (CAP) for the purpose of providing recommendations to the Attorney General on ways to reduce the number of complaints of abuse made against employees of the INS and, most importantly, to minimize or eliminate the causes for those complaints. The CAP is seeking to address the complaints of impropriety by making recommendations on community policing and training initiatives for law enforcement personnel in order to strengthen the relationship between the INS and all members of the community.

The CAP is also reviewing the systems and procedures in the INS for responding to specific complaints alleging that an INS employee exercised his/her authority in an improper manner. The CAP will receive reports and assist in the coordination of local citizens' advisory committees and panels developed by Border Patrol Chief Patrol Agents and/or Immigration District Directors.

A notice was published in the Federal Register which established the CAP (February 11, 1994, at 59 FR 6658) in response to allegations of human rights abuses by the Border Patrol, especially along the Southwest border, and to concerns expressed by private citizens and organizations over the lack of responsive, expeditious, and objective complaint process. Continuation of this CAP will facilitate resolution of these issues, and assist the INS in furtherance

of its goal to build and maintain a good working relationship with all members of the community. It will serve to enhance public confidence in immigration law enforcement and to demonstrate the INS' commitment to respecting and protecting the rights of all individuals.

MEMBERSHIP: The CAP is composed of thirteen voting members appointed by the Attorney General. Four of these members are officials from the following components of the Department of Justice: Office of the Attorney General, the INS, and the Community Relations Service. Among these members is the Commissioner of the INS, who serves as the permanent chairperson.

The remaining nine members are private citizens concerned about civil rights, human relations, immigration issues, and ethics in public service. In addition, the CAP has two non-voting members: a Consulate or an Embassy official, representing the Government of Mexico, who serves in a permanent advisory capacity to the CAP, and the INS Director of the Office of Internal Audit who serves in a permanent capacity as the INS Liaison Representative. This composition has produced a balanced membership.

The CAP functions solely as an advisory body in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The renewal of its charter will be filed in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

CONTACT PERSON: Susan B. Wilt, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 425 I Street NW., Room 3260, Washington, DC 20536, Telephone: (202) 514-2373.

Dated: March 14, 1996.

Doris Meissner,

Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[FR Doc. 96-6679 Filed 3-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-10-M

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Alternative Dispute Resolution

AGENCY: National Credit Union Administration (NCUA).

ACTION: Policy statement.

SUMMARY: Consistent with the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1990, the Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994, the recommendations of the National Performance Review, and Executive Order 12988, NCUA has adopted a Statement of Policy on the

use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) techniques to resolve appropriate disputes in a fair, timely, and cost efficient manner.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 13, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa Henderson, Staff Attorney, Office of General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314-3428, telephone (703) 518-6561.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1990 (ADRA) encouraged federal agencies to employ consensual methods of dispute resolution as alternatives to litigation. Congress enacted the ADRA to reduce the time, cost, inefficiencies, and contentiousness that too often are associated with litigation and other adversarial dispute resolution mechanisms. Although the ADRA sunset in October 1995, federal agencies continue to have authority to use ADR techniques to resolve disputes.

Support and encouragement for the use of ADR in federal agencies have come from other sources. In September 1993, Vice President Gore recommended that federal agencies "increase the use of alternative means of dispute resolution." Report of the National Performance Review, Recommendation REG06 (Sept. 7, 1993).

A year later, Congress enacted the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994. Section 309(e) of the statute requires that NCUA implement a pilot program for using ADR methods to resolve: a) claims against insured credit unions for which NCUA has been appointed conservator or liquidating agent; b) actions taken by NCUA in its capacity as conservator or liquidating agent; and c) any other issue for which the NCUA Board determines that ADR would be appropriate. The statute mandates that the program: a) be fair to all interested parties; b) resolve disputes expeditiously; and c) be less costly than traditional means of dispute resolution, including litigation.

On February 5, 1996, President Clinton signed Executive Order 12988, addressing civil justice reform. Section 1 of the Executive Order directs those federal agencies and litigation counsel that conduct civil litigation on behalf of the United States Government in federal court to follow certain guidelines designed to promote the just and efficient resolution of civil claims. The guidelines encourage litigation counsel to resolve claims through informal

discussions, negotiations, and settlements rather than through formal court proceedings. They state that it is appropriate for litigation counsel to use ADR techniques to resolve claims after determining that the use of a particular technique is warranted for a particular claim and will materially contribute to the prompt, fair, and efficient resolution of the claim. Finally, the guidelines state that litigation counsel should be trained in ADR techniques to facilitate broader and effective use of ADR.

In light of the above, the NCUA Board has adopted the following policy statement.

Statement of Policy on Alternative Dispute Resolution

Alternative dispute resolution is the resolution of disputes through informal, voluntary consensual techniques. NCUA is committed to the use of ADR as a tool to resolve disputes at the earliest stage possible in an expeditious, cost effective, and mutually acceptable manner. NCUA adopts this policy to express its full support for ADR and to set forth a framework for the continuing and expanded use of ADR. NCUA fully supports the cost-effective use of ADR, including negotiation, mediation, early neutral evaluation, minitrials, use of settlement judges, and other hybrid forms of ADR in appropriate instances.

NCUA will consider ADR in any dispute in which a negotiated solution is a potentially acceptable outcome. The individual at NCUA who has decision-making authority in a particular matter will determine whether to use ADR in the matter and which method to use. Not every dispute is suitable for settlement through ADR. NCUA views ADR processes as supplementary to, not a displacement of, traditional adjudicative methods of resolving disputes. NCUA will engage in ADR only after determining that ADR is appropriate in a particular case.

The factors NCUA will use to determine whether ADR is appropriate in a particular case are as follows: (1) A creative solution, not necessarily available in formal adjudication, may provide the most satisfactory outcome; (2) The case does not involve or require the setting of precedent; (3) All of the substantially affected parties are involved in the proceeding; (4) Variation in outcome is not a major concern; (5) The parties are likely to agree to use ADR; (6) Litigation likely would be a lengthy and/or expensive process; (7) Cases of this type frequently settle at some point in the process; and (8) The potential for impasse is high.

The particular ADR method selected will depend on the specifics of the case.