B. Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene—Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, .211, .214. In determining the appropriate action to take, the Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the commission's rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.

C1. Filing and Service of Responsive Documents—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title ''COMMENTS'' ''RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS'', ''PROTEST'', OR ''MOTION TO INTERVENE'', as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. Any of the above-named documents must be filed by providing the original and the number of copies provided by the Commission's regulations to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. A copy of any motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.

D2. Agency Comments—Federal, state, and local agencies are invited to file comments on the described application. A copy of the application may be obtained by agencies directly from the Applicant. If an agency does not file comments with the time specified for filing comments, it will be presumed to have no comments. One copy of an agency's comments must also be sent to the Applicant's representatives.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–31117 Filed 11–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Public Outreach Meeting

November 17, 1998.

Between the years 2000 and 2010, a number of hydropower project licenses in California will expire. We have scheduled a public outreach meeting in Sacramento, California for the purpose of discussing concerns and experiences stakeholders may have in using an alternative process in licensing hydropower projects. The agenda is as follows:

Place: Sterling Hotel, 1300 H Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

Date: Wednesday, December 9, 1998.

Time: 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The Sterling Hotel is located in downtown Sacramento at the junction of 13th Street and ''H'' Street. From the Sacramento Airport, it is about a 15 minute drive. From the Airport take Interstate 5 South to the ''Old Sacramento J Street'' off-ramp. Go on J Street and make a left onto 13th. Take 13th to H Street. There is a parking garage between ''J'' and ''I'' Streets on 13th.

For further information, please contact Theresa Gibson at (202) 219–2793.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–31112 Filed 11–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6191–8]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request: Application for the National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals

AGENCY: U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that EPA is planning to submit the following proposed Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB): National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals, EPA ICR #1888.01. Before submitting the ICR to OMB for review and approval, EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection (see the section A below entitled ''Questions to Consider in Making Comments''). This document provides information on the need for the roster and the information to be recorded in the roster and a discussion of qualification requirements for applicants wishing to be listed on the roster. Copies of the qualifications requirements and draft application form have been distributed widely for review through professional societies such as the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution and the International Association of Public Participation. The Roster will not be open to receive applications until all Paperwork Reduction Act requirements are met.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before January 22, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the Consensus and Dispute Resolution Program, Mail Code 2136, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC 20460, fax: (202) 260–5478.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deborah Dalton, Deputy Director, Consensus and Dispute Resolution Program, Mail Code 2136, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC 20460, fax: (202) 260–5478; email:dalton.deborah@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Potentially Affected Persons

You are potentially affected by this action if you are a dispute resolution or consensus building professional in the environmental or natural resources field who wishes to be listed on the National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals. This Roster will be one of several sources of information which federal environmental and natural resource agencies will use to identify appropriately experienced conflict resolution professionals for use in resolving environmental and natural resource disputes or issues in controversy under the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1996 and the Negotiated Rulemaking Act of 1996.

Title: Application for the National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals—EPA ICR #1888.01.

Background

A. Questions to Consider in Making Comments

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution and EPA request your comments to any of the following questions related to establishing a National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals:

(1) Is the proposed roster (''collection of information'') necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agencies, including whether the information will have practical utility?;

(2) Is the agencies' estimate of the time spent completing the application form (''burden of the proposed

collection of information'') accurate, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used?;

(3) Can you suggest ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?; and

(4) Can you suggest ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses?

B. What Are the Statutory Bases for Use of Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals in Agency Disputes?

The Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (ADRA), Public Law 101–552, authorizes and encourages agencies to use mediation and other consensual methods of dispute resolution as alternatives to traditional dispute resolution processes. The Negotiated Rulemaking Act (NRA), Public Law 101–648, authorizes and encourages agencies to use consensus building methods as a means of developing regulations. Both Acts anticipate the use of a ''neutral,'' an individual who, with respect to an issue in controversy, functions specifically to help the parties in resolving the controversy. Neutrals may be facilitators, mediators, conciliators, arbitrators or early neutral evaluators. The 1990 ADRA called for the Administrative Conference of the U.S. to establish standards for neutrals and to maintain a roster of individuals who met the standards. The Administrative Conference of the U.S. was abolished in 1995 and its roster subsequently lapsed.

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution was established by Congress in 1997 (Public Law 105–156) to assist in the resolution of environmental conflicts in which the federal government is a stakeholder. The Institute is housed at the Morris K. Udall Foundation, a federal commission located in Tucson, Arizona. The Institute is authorized to direct its resources to resolve costly environmental conflicts outside the courtroom and to foster collaborative agreements among affected parties concerning the implementation of federal environmental, public lands and natural resources policy. Federal agencies are authorized by the new law to employ the Institute to assist in alternative conflict resolution in matters involving environmental, natural resources and land-related disputes. The Institute will operate primarily as a facilitator and broker for public and private stakeholders. The Institute's small professional staff will accomplish most of its work through partnering and subcontracting with existing qualified professionals with longstanding experience in environmental conflict resolution and consensus building. The legislation requires the Institute, to the maximum extent possible, to use service providers in the geographic area of the conflict.

C. Why Is a New Roster Needed?

Identification of an appropriate, experienced neutral is an essential step in initiating and conducting a credible dispute resolution or consensus building process. There are a number of ways that parties to a conflict identify neutrals—past experience with a neutral, recommendations from colleagues, professional directories, yellow pages of phone books, responses to Requests for Proposal, etc. None of these processes is particularly rigorous or efficient in terms of timing, particularly when the parties are seeking persons with specialized expertise.

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution is charged with assisting in the resolution of environmental, public lands and natural resources conflicts that involve federal agencies as stakeholders. Consistent with its mandate, the Institute must be able to identify appropriate experienced dispute resolution and consensus building professionals in an expedited manner. This national roster will serve as a primary source for the Institute to access qualified professionals who have specific background and expertise sought by stakeholders to environmental conflicts.

EPA has long had a nationwide contract listing numerous dispute resolution consultants and firms. This contract provides excellent service for national level issues, but it can be cumbersome and time consuming in seeking out neutrals for local site or facility-based disputes or consensus building efforts.

In 1997, EPA conducted a study to examine whether a specialized roster was necessary and whether any existing rosters (public or private) could fulfill the need. The study concluded that EPA (especially regional offices of EPA) needed a specialized roster or database which would list neutrals experienced in helping parties in environmental cases, and that there was no existing database that would meet EPA's needs. The study identified a number of federal, state and private rosters of neutrals. The other existing Federal roster, the FDIC Roster of Neutrals (OMB #3064–0107), does not contain significant numbers of neutrals experienced in environmental or natural resource matters. A number of states have rosters of environmental neutrals, but the entry qualifications vary significantly and even taken together, they do not provide adequate nationwide coverage.

The Roster developed as a result of this ICR will provide the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, EPA and other federal agencies with the ability to identify an additional number, range and variety of dispute resolution and consensus building service providers throughout the U.S. The ICR will provide two kinds of information: (1) Information to determine if the individual applying has met the basic entry qualifications; (2) information to be used in conducting database searches to match cases or issues with potential neutrals experienced in particular kinds of disputes or issues.

D. How Were the Roster Entry Qualifications and Information Developed?

EPA has entered into an Interagency Agreement with the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution to develop a roster specifically designed to identify dispute resolution and consensus building professionals (neutrals) with environmental and/or natural resource public policy experience. The U.S. Institute convened a workgroup to give individual opinions and advice to the Institute and EPA regarding whether or not the roster should have entry qualifications and how the roster should be constructed and managed. The workgroup consists of EPA dispute resolution specialists and contracting officers, state dispute resolution officials, private dispute resolution practitioners and academics. As a result of the individual advice of the workgroup and others who have responded to requests for opinions, the U.S. Institute and the EPA are proposing the entry criteria and information collection items included in this Information Collection Request.

In addition to the public comment being solicited in this notice, the U.S. Institute and EPA are conducting extensive outreach to professional associations of dispute resolution and consensus building professionals, state offices of dispute resolution, individual dispute resolution practitioners, professional associations of attorneys, and environmental and citizens groups though presentations at professional meetings and conventions and through individual contacts with people and

organizations who have participated in previous dispute resolution efforts.

E. What Are the Roster Entry Qualifications?

As a result of consultations with the workgroup, the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution and EPA are proposing the following basic entry criteria for an individual seeking to be listed on the Roster database.

Draft Roster Entry Criteria

In order to be listed on the National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals, a person must: (1) Have served as the principal or co-principal professional on two to five environmental cases. Each case must have involved at least 40 direct case hours of contact and in the aggregate must total at least 200 case hours; and (2) accumulate a total of at least 50 points across three scoring categories, including process experience, interactive training experience, and substantive background. The scoring categories and scoring system are presented in the chart below:

Scoring categories and subcategories (50 points required for entry)	Range of points for each sub-category	Maximum points for the category
1. Process Experience		90
a. Number of environmental or public policy cases in the last 10 years as principal or co-principal professional—5 points per case up to 10 cases.	0–50	
b. Additional credit if any of those cases were complex environmental or public policy cases—5 additional points per case up to 5 cases.	0–25	
c. Number of environmental or public policy cases in the last 10 years as apprentice or junior professional—3 points per case up to 5 cases.	0–15	
2. Interactive Process Training		20
a. Training experience—At least 24 hours of basic interactive training and 16 hours of advanced interactive training in dispute resolution and consensus building.	0 or 10	
b. Trainer—Directed at least 40 hours of basic interactive training in dispute resolution and consensus building.	0 or 10	
c. Senior Trainer/teacher experience—Directed interactive training in dispute resolution and consensus building totaling 150 contact hours.	0 or 20	
3. Substantive Experience		25
a. Graduate degrees or graduate program certificates in substantively relevant fields, such as law, environmental sciences or policy, engineering, public administration or management, communication theory, planning, conflict resolution—10 points for up to one degree/certificate.	0 or 10	
b. Years of employment or volunteer experience in the above fields—1 point for every year up to 15 years	0–15	

Definitions

1. Case—A case is an actual or potential dispute or lack of agreement on one or more issues. A case may also be described as a process of building agreement, recommendations or advice on actual or potential issues in controversy as well as facilitating collaborative processes among multiple parties on actual or potential issues in controversy. Systems design and evaluation work would also be included. For purposes of entry, a case must have engaged the applicant for more than 40 case hours.

a. Environmental Case—Cases or processes involving environmental pollution prevention or cleanup, land use, natural resource use or distribution, environmental permitting, facility siting disputes, environmental justice, negotiated rulemaking, enforcement or compliance.

b. Public Policy Case—Cases or processes involving the setting of governmental policy at the national, regional, state or local level, such as environmental or natural resource policy, health policy, or education policy.

c. Complex Environmental or Public Policy Case—An environmental or public policy case where there are multiple issues at stake involving at least four parties representing distinct interests at the table, at least one of whom is a governmental entity.

2. Case Hours—Actual contact time with the parties as individuals or a group, plus time spent in dispute or conflict assessment, dispute resolution process design, conduct of all phases of the process, or evaluating or reporting on the process. This does not include hours spent prior to professional engagement in the project.

3. Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professional—Any third party neutral engaged to help all parties in the prevention or resolution of disputes or controversy. In order to gain entry to this roster, the environmental dispute resolution and consensus building professional must have expertise in one or more of the following processes: conciliation, facilitation, mediation, neutral evaluation or assessment, fact finding, mini-trials, arbitration, dispute systems design.

4. Principal or Co-principal Professional—An environmental dispute resolution and consensus building professional who has been engaged to serve as or share the lead in conduct of a case. If serving as a co-principal professional, one must be acting as a co-lead with equal role in the conduct of the case.

5. Apprentice or Junior Professional—An assistant to the principal or co-principal professionals in the conduct of a case.

6. Interactive Process Training—Training in alternative dispute resolution processes and techniques, such as mediation, facilitation, and conflict management, which is interactive in nature incorporating a substantial number of role plays, simulations, and interactive group demonstrations.

F. What Kinds of Additional Information Are Sought for Roster Database Searches?

As a result of the 1997 EPA study and the individual recommendations from the Roster Workgroup, there are data elements in the ICR that we will use for conducting database searches on behalf of parties to an issue or dispute. Such elements include: geographic location of previous cases, languages spoken, minority group identification, experience with certain types of common environmental disputes, special skills or background. The U.S. Institute and EPA have developed a

draft application form to obtain information both to make decisions on whether an applicant qualifies for the roster and to record other relevant information.

G. Draft Application Form

Please note that the format of this form may change when the U.S. Institute and EPA select the database software for the Roster. We will also be making every effort to allow for methods to obtain and possibly submit the application electronically.

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

Draft OMB Number: October 6, 1998

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Application for the National Roster of
Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals

DISCLOSURE OF ESTIMATED REPORTING BURDEN: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 90 minutes, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering the data requested, and completing and reviewing the form. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this form, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to ...

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Complete all information requested on this form. Please type or print legibly. DO NOT send a resume or other material in lieu of this form. Information from these submissions will be made available to the disputants and public agencies. Successful applicants will be responsible for updating information included on the roster.

I. General Information

Last name		Address	
First name			
Middle initial		City	
Bus. phone		State	
Fax		Zip code	
Home phone		email	

II. Organizational Affiliation (☐ full time; ☐ part time; ☐ none (if none, go to Section 3)

Name of organization		Address	
Telephone			
Fax		City	
No. of neutrals		State	
No. of other staff		Zip code	
		email	
		web address	

☐ Non-profit
☐ Business firm
☐ Government agency

DRAFT
DO NOT SUBMIT

III. Services Provided

A. Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Services

Check each service that you have experience in providing and are willing to provide in the future.

☐ Mediation of environmental disputes
☐ Mediation of "complex" environmental disputes
☐ Facilitation of consensus building processes
☐ Regulatory negotiations
☐ Policy dialogues
☐ Superfund allocation disputes
☐ Neutral evaluations
☐ Arbitration
☐ Mini-trials
☐ Convening processes
☐ Process/systems design
☐ Evaluation of ADR processes
☐ Dispute resolution training

B. In what locations have you previously worked?

Any state in the following regions:

- ☐ New England: CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT
- ☐ Mid-Atlantic: DE, MD, NY, NJ, PA, VA, WV
- ☐ Southeast: AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN
- ☐ Great Lakes: IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI
- ☐ North Central: IA, KS, MO, ND, NE, SD
- ☐ South Central: AR, LA, OK, TX
- ☐ Mountain: CO, ID, MT, WY
- ☐ Southwest: AZ, NM, NV, UT
- ☐ Pacific Southwest: CA
- ☐ Pacific Northwest: AK, OR, WA
- ☐ Pacific Islands: HI, Guam and Amer. Samoa
- ☐ Atlantic Islands: PR, VI
- ☐ Foreign Countries (please list): _____

C. What are your capacities to handle special requirements (either internal to your organizational, or through subcontracting)?

- ☐ Logistical support for complex cases
- ☐ Meeting summaries and reports
- ☐ Translations and other language support
- ☐ Database management
- ☐ Web page and computer support
- ☐ Access to technical experts

D. Fee Structure

Hourly Rate	Other fees and expenses (specify).
	Conditions or exceptions (specify).

DRAFT DO NOT SUBMIT

IV. Process Experience (Please review the definitions for all italicized terms before answering the following questions.)

A. Number of *environmental or public policy* cases in the last 10 years for which you served as *principal* or *co-principal*	☐ 0-3 ☐ 4-7 ☐ 8-15 ☐ > 15
B. Number of *complex environmental or public policy* cases in the last 5 years for which you served as *principal* or *co-principal*	☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ >3

Draft OMB Number: October 6, 1998

C. Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Case Descriptions

Please list your most relevant cases and provide the information requested. You should provide as many cases (up to 10) as you indicate under "number of environmental or public policy cases" in IV.A. above. Only list cases completed during the last 10 years. Do not include cases where you were acting as common counsel, judge or hearing officer.

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5
Descriptive name of case (Please use up to 50 characters)					
Case descriptor (use codes shown at end of form)					
No. of parties	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10
ADR role	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____
Level of your involvement	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior
No. of *case hours* you spent on case	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100
Scale of case	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international
case end date or current year if ongoing					
Is case more fully described below?	check if more fully described below ☐	check if more fully described below ☐	check if more fully described below ☐	check if more fully described below ☐	check if more fully described below ☐

DRAFT
DO NOT SUBMIT

C (continued). Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Case Descriptions

	Case 6	Case 7	Case 8	Case 9	Case 10
Descriptive name of case (Please use up to 50 characters)					
Case descriptor (use codes shown below)					
No. of parties	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10	☐ 0 - 3 ☐ 4 -10 ☐ > 10
ADR role	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____	☐ mediator ☐ facilitator ☐ arbitrator ☐ process/system designer or evaluator ☐ neutral fact finder ☐ other:_____
Level of your involvement	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior	☐ principal or co-principal ☐ apprentice/junior
No. of *case hours* you spent on case	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100	☐ 1-39 ☐ 40-100 ☐ > 100
Scale of case (check the one or two most applicable)	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international	☐ local/community ☐ state/regional ☐ national ☐ international
case end date, or current year if ongoing					
Is case more fully described below?	check if more fully described below ☐	check if more fully described below ☐	check if more fully described below ☐	check if more fully described below ☐	check if more fully described below ☐

Draft Do Not Quote

Draft OMB Number:

D. In order to meet the entry criteria for this roster, you must have served as *principal* or *co-principal* dispute resolution or consensus building professional on at least two *environmental cases* which in the aggregate total at least 200 *case hours*. List the *environmental cases* listed in IV-C above which together add up to 200 *case hours*.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

E. In order to receive additional credit for work on *complex environmental or public policy cases*, please list up to five cases described in IV-C above which meet the following definition: an environmental or public policy case where there are multiple issues at stake involving at least four parties representing distinct interests at the table, at least one of whom is a governmental entity.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

DRAFT
DO NOT SUBMIT

F. Provide two references (with address and phone numbers) for each of two cases listed above.

Case name: _____

Reference 1: _____

Reference 2: _____

Case name: _____

Reference 1: _____

Reference 2: _____

G. Detailed Case Descriptions

Select up to five of the cases presented in IV-C above. Choose cases that represent the types and range of cases with which you work. These descriptions will be made available to prospective roster clients, so be as clear and descriptive as possible.

Descriptive name of case (use same name as used in table above)	*For each case, provide up to 40 words describing the case (types of parties, location, issues, outcomes) and your role in it.*

DRAFT DO NOT SUBMIT

Draft OMB Number: October 6, 1998

V. Interactive Process Training

Please check any of the following that apply to you:

☐ I have taken 24 hours of general training in mediation or facilitation *and* an additional 16 hours of advanced training in complex or multiparty disputes, environmental disputes or systems design.

☐ I have taught as a lead trainer and teacher at least 40 hours of interactive seminar or skills building courses in mediation, facilitation, or consensus building for complex or multiparty disputes, environmental disputes or systems design.

☐ I have taught as a lead trainer and teacher at least 150 hours of interactive seminar or skills building courses in mediation, facilitation, or consensus building for complex or multiparty disputes, environmental disputes or systems design.

For each box checked above, please substantiate by listing the names of courses, with dates, locations, and your involvement.

Course Name	Course Dates	Course Location	Your Involvement

DRAFT DO NOT SUBMIT

VI. Other Relevant Education and Experience

A. Graduate Education and Program Certifications

Name of school	*City and state of school*	*Degree or graduate program certification achieved*	*Substantive focus of degree (use codes shown below)*	*Year of degree*

B. Work and Voluntary Professional Experience

Organization	*Full time or part time?*	*Occupation, Position or Title*	*Professional Field Code (listed at end of questionnaire)*	*Dates Worked*		*Number of FTE years worked*
				From	*To*	
	☐ full time ☐ part time					
	☐ full time ☐ part time					
	☐ full time ☐ part time					
	☐ full time ☐ part time					
	☐ full time ☐ part time					
					Total number of years:	

DRAFT
DO NOT SUBMIT

C. Narrative Description of Experience (Optional)

In the space below (200 words or less), summarize your experience in providing mediation, facilitation and other dispute resolution services. Provide information that you believe would be useful to stakeholders in determining whether you would be an appropriate neutral for their dispute.

D. Language Skills

Spoken Languages	*Level of Fluency (Fair, Good, Excellent)*

6. Minority and Women Status (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Caucasian
- ☐ Native American
- ☐ African American
- ☐ Hispanic American
- ☐ Asian-Pacific American
- ☐ Woman
- ☐ You are affiliated with an organization which is 51% or more owned by one or more of the above listed minority groups

DRAFT DO NOT SUBMIT

7. Certification

Are you currently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment or suspension, or have you been declared ineligible for the award of contracts by any Federal agency or Government corporation?

☐ Yes ☐ No

I certify that the above information and all information I am submitting in connection with this questionnaire is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and that I will be removed from consideration or placement on the EPA Roster for falsifying any information provided. False certification may also subject me to civil or criminal penalties as prescribed in 18 U.S.C. § 1001. In understanding that all information provided is a public record. If I am listed on the EPA Roster, I agree to abide by the Ethical Standards of Professional Responsibility developed by the Society for Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR) and such other professional standards as are applicable to me.

Signed: _____

Codes for Use in Filling Out This Questionnaire

Case Descriptor Codes	*Code*	*Professional Field Codes*	*Code*
Air quality - general		Mediator, facilitator	
Air quality – stationary source		Arbitrator	
Air quality - mobile sources			
Water quality - drinking water		Arts, design	
Water quality - general		Architecture	
Wetlands		Area and cultural studies	
Watershed, estuary		Business, management	
Water management		Communications	
Coastal zone		Criminal justice	
Birds, fish, game management		Building construction, development, real estate	

Draft OMB Number: October 6, 1998

Case Descriptor Codes	*Code*	*Professional Field Codes*	*Code*
Endangered species		Economics	
Ecosystem management and sustainable development		Education	
Resource management		Engineering: chemical	
Public lands management		Engineering: civil	
Forestry		Engineering: environmental	
Land use, growth management		Finance	
Energy		Geography, history, sociology, anthropology, archeology	
Radiation, nuclear power, nuclear waste		International affairs, political science	
Hazardous or solid waste disposal		Humanities, philosophy	
Hazardous waste remediation, Superfund		Law	
Allocation of liability for damages		Languages, literature, linguistics	
NEPA, CEQA		Planning	
Facility, dam, road siting		Psychology, mental health	
Mining and minerals		Public interest work	
Transportation		Public policy, government, elected official	
Public health		Science: environmental	
Oceans		Science: biology, ecology	
Pollution Prevention		Science: chemistry, biochemistry	
Archeological, historic preservation		Science: earth, geology, atmospheric	
Native American sovereignty		Social work, social services	
Treaties - international		Other Engineering	
Permits		Other Professional	
Pesticides, toxic substances		Other Science	
Right to Know		Other	
Environmental technology or futures			
Recycling, conservation			
Public health			
Other health or medical issues			
Other Environmental			
Other Public Policy			
Other Neighborhood or Community			

DRAFT DO NOT SUBMIT

BILLING CODE 6560–50–C

H. Will This Roster Be the Only Source of Conflict Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals for Environmental Disputes?

No. This Roster will be one of several sources of information with federal environmental and natural resource agencies will use to identify appropriately experienced dispute resolution and consensus building professionals for use in resolving environmental and natural resource disputes or issues in controversy under the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1996 and the Negotiated Rulemaking Act of 1996. However, an individual who wishes to be considered as a neutral in environmental or natural resources public policy matters is not required to be listed on this roster. Federal government personnel and parties to environmental or natural resources issues will not be limited to this Roster in identifying and contracting for the services of neutrals. We hope that this Roster will expedite the identification of individuals who are appropriate to act as neutrals in a dispute and that the information in the Roster will shorten the time needed to complete contract documents.

The U.S. Institute will review all applications submitted against the entry criteria. Those who are qualified will be listed on the database; those who do not qualify may reapply as their professional experience develops. Professionals who are not included in this database are in no way barred from work on disputes involving federal agencies and the U.S. Institute will explicitly inform parties of other known rosters they may wish to consult when selecting a neutral.

I. Does Being on This Roster Guarantee Conflict Resolution Work for the Government?

No. Being listed on the database does not guarantee that you will be offered work as a neutral in U.S. government cases. The decision as to whom to retain as a neutral lies with the parties to an issue or dispute. Being listed on this database may increase the chances of parties finding out that you offer conflict resolution or consensus building services.

J. Burden Statement and Estimate

Burden Statement: This ICR compiles data available from the resumes of most conflict resolution and consensus building professionals into a format that is standardized for database searches and retrievals. A professional will need to complete the entire form only once. Professionals will be allowed to update their information on a voluntary basis periodically so that the database reflects their most current experience, and may be required to update their experience every five years. The database system is being designed to allow for some electronic information submittal. The burden includes time spent to access the professional's most recent detailed resume and to insert that information into the ICR form.

Estimated Number of Respondents (first year): 400.

Estimated Time per Response: 90 minutes.

Estimated Total First Year Burden: 600 hours.

Estimated Number of New Respondents (per year for succeeding years): 20.

Estimate Time per Response: 90 minutes.

Estimated Number of Updates (per year for succeeding years): 50.

Estimated Time per Update: 15 minutes.

Estimated Subsequent Year Annual Burden: 42.5 hours.

Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information and transmit information.

Dated: October 28, 1998.

Paul Lapsley,

Director, Regulation Management Division, Office of Regulation Management and Information, Office of Policy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Kirk Emerson,

Director, U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, Morris K. Udall Foundation.

[FR Doc. 98–31243 Filed 11–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6192–2]

Technical Workshop on Issues Associated With Dermal Exposure and Uptake

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: EPA is announcing a meeting, organized and convened by Eastern Research Group, Inc., a contractor to EPA's Risk Assessment Forum, for external scientific peer consultation on issues related to the assessment of dermal exposure and uptake. The meeting is being held to discuss methods under development or currently in use by EPA to assess dermal exposure to environmental contaminants with subsequent absorption across the skin.

DATES: The meeting will begin on Thursday, December 10, 1998, at 8:30 a.m. and end on Friday, December 11, 1998, at 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Bethesda Ramada, 8400 Wisconsin Ave., Bethesda, Maryland 20814. Eastern Research Group, Inc., an EPA contractor, will convene and facilitate the workshop. To register to attend the workshop as an observer, contact Eastern Research Group, Inc., Tel: (781) 674–7374, or visit their HomePage at *http://www.erg.com/erg/confer.htm* by December 1, 1998. You may also obtain additional information and register by visiting the National Center for Environmental Assessment HomePage at *http://www.epa.gov/ncea/new.htm*. Space is limited so please register early.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information concerning the workshop on dermal exposure and uptake issues please contact Steven Knott, U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development (8601–D), 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, Telephone (202) 564–3359.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: During the development of EPA guidance on assessing dermal exposure to and uptake of environmental contaminants, several generic, cross-cutting issues have been identified. These issues were referred to the EPA Risk Assessment Forum (RAF) for discussions within the broader scientific community. The present Workshop is being held to provide a peer consultation for invited participants to discuss these issues. The information obtained through these discussions will be considered by EPA as work continues on dermal exposure and risk initiatives.

In January 1992, the EPA Office of Health and Environmental Assessment (now the National Center for Environmental Assessment, NCEA) completed an interim report entitled Dermal Exposure Assessment: Principles and Applications. This report provides guidance for conducting dermal exposure and risk assessments. Using this as a foundation, a workgroup convened under the Superfund program has been developing an expanded and updated guidance on dermal exposure