

Mediation, which involves the use of a trained neutral third party to help disputants negotiate a mutually agreeable settlement, may be suitable when one or more of the following characteristics are present: (1) The parties are looking for a substantial level of control over the resolution of the dispute; (2) The parties have, or expect to have, an ongoing relationship; (3) Communication between the parties has broken down to a significant degree; (4) The legal standards for decision are fairly clear, or neither party has a need to clarify them; or (5) There are multiple issues to be resolved.

Early neutral evaluation involves using a neutral factfinder, often one with substantive expertise, to evaluate the relative merits of the parties' cases. This process, which can be used early on in a dispute, usually involves an informal presentation to the neutral of the highlights of the parties' cases or positions. The neutral provides a nonbinding evaluation, sometimes in writing, which can give parties a more objective perspective on the strengths and weaknesses of their cases, thereby making further negotiations more likely to be productive. Early neutral evaluation may be an appropriate process when some or all of the following are characteristics of the dispute: (1) The dispute involves technical or factual issues that lend themselves to expert evaluation; (2) The parties disagree significantly about the value of their case; (3) Top decision-makers of one or more parties could be better informed about the real strengths and weaknesses of the case; or (4) The parties are seeking an alternative to extensive discovery.

A minitrial is a structured settlement process in which the disputants agree on a procedure for presenting their cases in highly abbreviated versions (usually no more than a few hours or a few days) to the senior officials for each side with the authority to settle the dispute. This process allows those in senior positions to see first hand how their case and that of other parties play out, and can serve as a basis for more fruitful negotiations. Often, a neutral presides over the hearing, and may subsequently mediate the dispute or help parties evaluate their cases. The procedures for minitrials are developed by agreement among the parties. Minitrials can be useful in cases that have some or all of the following characteristics: (1) Getting important facts and positions before high-level decision-makers for the parties is important; (2) The parties are looking for a substantial level of control over the resolution of the dispute; (3) Some or all of the issues are of a technical nature;

or (4) A trial on the merits would be very long and/or complex.

A settlement judge serves essentially as a mediator or neutral evaluator in cases pending before a tribunal. The settlement judge is usually a second judge from the same body as the judge who will ultimately make the decision if the case is not resolved by the parties. In some cases, a settlement judge may give an informal advisory opinion. Settlement judges can be useful in cases that have some or all of the following characteristics: (1) The case is in formal adjudication; or (2) The parties have not been able to negotiate a settlement on their own.

Common to most of the processes discussed above is the use of a neutral third party. NCUA anticipates that most of the time a neutral is used to resolve a dispute with an outside party, the neutral will not be an employee of NCUA. Neutrals are available from other federal agencies, court systems, and private companies. In all cases, the particular neutral will be approved by all parties to the dispute.

The Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 required that NCUA's use of ADR processes: 1) be fair to all interested parties; 2) resolve disputes expeditiously; and 3) be less costly than traditional means of dispute resolution, including litigation. In addition to those objectives, NCUA's goals in using ADR techniques will be to: (1) Free up personnel and other resources; (2) Create opportunities for wider ranges of creative solutions and possible options; (3) Forge better relationships among disputing parties, inside and outside the agency; (4) Improve communication between and within parties; (5) Improve the satisfaction level of disputants with both the process and substantive results of the dispute resolution process; and (6) Improve the reliability of information on which decisions are based.

In furtherance of its commitment to ADR and in response to Executive Order 12988, NCUA will provide its litigation attorneys with training in ADR techniques. NCUA also will provide introductory ADR training to executives, managers, and supervisors so that they understand what ADR is, its potential benefits, and where to go for assistance.

This policy statement is intended only to improve the internal management of NCUA in resolving disputes. It shall not be construed as creating any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity, by a party against NCUA or its employees. This policy statement shall not be construed to create any right to

judicial review involving the compliance or noncompliance of NCUA or its employees with this statement. Nothing in this policy statement shall be construed to obligate NCUA to offer funds to settle any case, to accept a particular settlement or resolution of a dispute, to alter its standards for accepting settlements, to submit to binding arbitration, or to alter any existing delegation of settlement or litigating authority. NCUA will engage in ADR only if it consents to do so.

NCUA hereby announces that during the period from March 13, 1996, to August 13, 1997, it will conduct an ADR pilot project based on the principles and objectives set forth above. Every dispute in which the agency is engaged during that period will be evaluated to determine its appropriateness for ADR. At the end of the period, NCUA will evaluate the project to determine the effectiveness of its ADR program and whether changes need to be made to improve the program.

NCUA welcomes and encourages input on the use of ADR and comment on current and potential uses of ADR from both within and outside the agency.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board on March 13, 1996.

Becky Baker,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 96-6704 Filed 3-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7535-01-P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING MEETING: National Science Foundation, National Science Board.

DATE AND TIME: March 28, 1996, 8:00 a.m., open session; March 29, 1996, 7:30 a.m., closed session; March 29, 1996, 8:20 a.m., open session.

PLACE: University of California at Davis, Alpha Gamma Rho Hall, Beuhler Center, Old Davis Road, Davis, California 95616.

STATUS: Part of this meeting will be open to the public. Part of this meeting will be closed to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Thursday, March 28, 1996

Open Session (8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.)

Subject of Meeting: Science and Engineering Research and Education in the Twenty-First Century
 Session I—Research as a Public Priority
 Session II—The Research University as a Vital Contributor
 Session III—Capitalizing on Investments in Science and Engineering

Session IV—Research—A Key to Education

Friday, March 29, 1996

Closed Session (7:30 a.m.–8:20 a.m.)

Minutes, February 1996 Meeting

Alan T. Waterman Award

Other Awards

Friday, March 29, 1996

Open Session continued (8:20 a.m.–11:45 a.m.)

Minutes, February 1996 Meeting

Closed Session Agenda Items for May 1996 Meeting

Session V—Education—A Statewide Perspective

Session VI—Research, The Foundation of the Future

Adjourn

Marta Cehelsky,

Executive Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-6798 Filed 3-18-96; 10:16 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Catholic University of America

[Docket No. 50-77]

(Catholic University of America AGN-201 Research Reactor); Order Terminating Facility License

By application dated February 6, 1992, the Catholic University of America (the licensee) requested from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) authorization to dispose of the component parts of its Aerojet-General Nucleonics (AGN-201) Nuclear Research Reactor located in Washington, District of Columbia. A "Notice of Proposed Issuance of Orders Approving Decommissioning Plan, Authorizing Decommissioning, and Terminating Facility License" was published in the Federal Register on August 20, 1992, (57 FR 37850). No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following notice of the proposed action.

By Order dated September 24, 1992, (57 FR 45094), the Commission authorized dismantling of the facility and disposition of component parts as proposed in the decommissioning plan of the licensee. On June 2, 1995, the licensee requested approval for changes to the decommissioning plan. These changes were approved on July 17, 1995. By letter dated December 20, 1994, as supplemented on September 22, 1995, the licensee submitted the radiological survey report for the facility in accordance with the NRC approved decommissioning plan as amended.

This order applies to room B-16R of Pangborn Hall (also known as the

nuclear reactor room) and the machine shop in the power plant building at the Catholic University of America campus in Washington, D.C. The reactor fuel has been removed from the core and shipped to a Department of Energy (DOE) facility. The reactor facility has been completely dismantled and all requirements pertaining to residual radioactivity, personnel and external radiation exposure, and fuel disposition have been met. Confirmatory radiological surveys verified that the facility met the NRC approved decommissioning plan requirements for release of the facility for unrestricted use.

Accordingly, the Commission has found that the facility has been dismantled and decontaminated pursuant to the Commission's Order dated September 24, 1992, as supplemented on July 17, 1995. Satisfactory disposition has been made of the component parts and fuel in accordance with the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, and in a manner not inimical to the common defense and security, or to the health and safety of the public. Therefore, based on the application filed by the licensee, and pursuant to Sections 104 and 161 b, i, of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and in 10 CFR 50.82(f), Facility License No. R-31 is terminated as of the date of this Order.

In accordance with 10 CFR Part 51, the Commission has determined that the issuance of this termination Order will have no significant impact. The Environmental Assessment was published in the Federal Register on March 12, 1996 (61 FR 10037).

For further details with respect to this action see (1) the application for termination of Facility License No. R-31, dated February 6, 1992, as supplemented, (2) the Commission's Safety Evaluation related to the termination of the license, (3) the Environmental Assessment, and (4) the "Notice of Proposed Issuance of Orders Approving Decommissioning Plan, Authorizing Decommissioning, and Terminating Facility License," published in the Federal Register on August 20, 1992, (57 FR 37850). Each of these items is available for public inspection at the Commission Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20555.

Copies of items (2), (3) and (4) may be obtained upon addressed request to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Reactor Program Management.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 14th day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dennis M. Crutchfield,

Director, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-6673 Filed 3-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Extreme External Phenomena; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Extreme External Phenomena will hold a meeting on April 3, 1996, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, April 3, 1996—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business.

The Subcommittee will discuss the proposed final revisions to 10 CFR Part 50 and 10 CFR Part 100, new Appendix S to Part 50, and associated Regulatory Guides and Standard Review Plan sections. This rulemaking covers two considerations. First is the proposed final rule revising 10 CFR Part 100, "Reactor Site Criteria," for future plants and the second rule will replace Appendix A, "Seismic and Geologic Siting Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants," to 10 CFR Part 100 as the licensing bases for new plants. Both considerations address the relocation of plant design criteria and source term and dose calculations from Part 100 to Part 50. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be