

**FEDERAL EMERGENCY  
MANAGEMENT AGENCY****Open Meeting, Technical Mapping  
Advisory Council**

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

**ACTION:** Notice of teleconference meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with § 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. 1, the Federal Emergency Management Agency gives notice that the following meeting will be held:

*Name:* Technical Mapping Advisory Council.

*Date of Meeting:* July 8, 1999.

*Place:* The FEMA Conference Operator in Washington, DC will initiate the teleconference. Individuals interested in participating should call 1-800-320-4330 at the time of the teleconference. Callers will be prompted for the conference code, #16, and then connected through to the teleconference.

*Time:* 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., EST.

**Proposed Agenda:**

1. Call to order.
2. Announcements.
3. Action on minutes from May 1999 meeting.
4. Status of letter regarding possible extension of Council's duration.
5. Update on recommendations.
6. Discuss preparation for the 1999 Annual Report.
7. Discuss agenda for September 1999 meeting in Louisville, KY.
8. Discuss agenda for December 1999 meeting in Washington, DC.
9. New business.
10. Adjournment.

**Status:** This meeting is open to the public.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Michael K. Buckley, P.E., Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., room 421, Washington, DC 20472, telephone (202) 646-2756 or by facsimile at (202) 646-4596.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Minutes of the meeting will be prepared and will be available upon request 30 days after they have been approved by the next Technical Mapping Advisory Council meeting in September 1999.

Dated: June 14, 1999.

**Michael J. Armstrong,**

*Associate Director for Mitigation.*

[FR Doc. 99-15808 Filed 6-21-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-04-P

**FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

[File No. 9723075]

**Tiger Direct, Inc.; 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 August 23, 1999.

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Andrew Caverly or Colleen Lynch, Boston Regional Office, Federal Trade Commission, 101 Merrimac Street, Suite 810, Boston, MA 02114-4719, (617) 424-5960.

**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 sixty (60) 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 June 10th, 1999), on the World Wide Web, at "http://www.ftc.gov/os/actions97.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 by calling (202) 326-3627.

Public comment is invited. Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, 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)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

**Analysis of Proposed Consent Order To  
Aid Public Comment**

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted, subject to final approval, an agreement containing a consent order from Tiger Direct, Inc. ("Tiger Direct"), a mail order retailer of computer products.

The proposed consent order has been placed on the public record for sixty (60) days for reception of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After sixty (60) days, the Commission will again review the agreement and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement or make final the agreement's proposed order.

The Commission's complaint alleges that Tiger Direct violated Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act"), 15 U.S.C. 45(a)(1), by deceptively advertising its on-site warranty service for Tiger-brand computer systems. Additionally, the complaint alleges that Tiger Direct has violated the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act ("Warranty Act"), 15 U.S.C. 2301 *et seq.*, and two Rules promulgated thereunder: the Rule concerning the Disclosure of Written Consumer Product Warranty Terms and Conditions ("Disclosure Rule"), 16 CFR 701; and the Rule concerning the Pre-Sale Availability of Written Warranty Terms ("Pre-Sale Availability Rule"), 16 CFR 702. Under Section 110(b) of the Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2310(b), violations of the Warranty Act or its Rules are also violations of Section 5 of the FTC Act.

First, the complaint alleges that Tiger Direct violated Section 5 of the FTC Act by misrepresenting that it would provide on-site warranty service to purchasers of Tiger-brand computer systems when notified that the system or any of its parts was defective or had malfunctioned and that it would provide such service within a reasonable period of time after being notified of a problem.

Second, the complaint alleges that Tiger Direct violated the Pre-Sale Availability Rule by failing to disclose material warranty terms or otherwise comply with the Rule. The complaint also alleges that Tiger Direct failed to comply with the requirements of the Disclosure Rule that certain language be