

standard area agreement. During the past year, the trustees of Plan A have brought lawsuits against several signatory employers seeking contributions allegedly owed, but not paid to the trust. In defending that litigation, a number of employers have sworn that they never intended to operate as union contractors, that their employees want nothing to do with Union A, that Union A procured their assent to the collective bargaining agreement solely by threats and fraudulent misrepresentations, and that Union A has failed to file certain reports required by the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. In at least one instance, a petition for a decertification election has been filed with the National Labor Relations Board. In this example, Plan A meets the criteria for a regulatory finding under this section that it is a multiemployer plan established and maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements, assuming that its participant population satisfies the 85% test of paragraph (b)(2) of this section and that none of the disqualifying factors in paragraph (c) of this section is present. Plan A's status for the purpose of this section is not affected by the fact that some of the employers who deal with Union A have challenged Union A's conduct, or have disputed under labor statutes and legal doctrines other than ERISA section 3(40) the validity and enforceability of their putative contract with Union A, regardless of the outcome of those disputes.

Example 8. Assume the same facts as Example 7. Plan A's benefits consultant recently entered into an arrangement with the Medical Consortium, a newly formed organization of health care providers, which allows the Plan to offer a broader range of health services to Plan A's participants while achieving cost savings to the Plan and to participants. Union A, Plan A, and Plan A's consultant each have added a page to their Web sites publicizing the new arrangement with the Medical Consortium. Concurrently, Medical Consortium's Web site prominently publicizes its recent affiliation with Plan A and the innovative services it makes available to the Plan's participants. Union A has mailed out informational packets to its members describing the benefit enhancements and encouraging election of family coverage. Union A has also begun distributing similar material to workers on hundreds of non-union construction job sites within its geographic territory. In this example, Plan A remains a plan established and maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements under section 3(40) of ERISA. Neither Plan A's relationship with a new organization of health care providers, nor the use of various media to publicize Plan A's attractive benefits throughout the area served by Union A, alters Plan A's status for purpose of this section.

Example 9. Assume the same facts as in Example 7. Union A undertakes an area-wide organizing campaign among the employees of all the health care providers who belong to the Medical Consortium. When soliciting individual employees to sign up as union members, Union A distributes Plan A's information materials and promises to

bargain for the same coverage. At the same time, when appealing to the employers in the Medical Consortium for voluntary recognition, Union A promises to publicize the Consortium's status as a group of unionized health care service providers. Union A eventually succeeds in obtaining recognition based on its majority status among the employees working for Medical Consortium employers. The Consortium, acting on behalf of its employer members, negotiates a collective bargaining agreement with Union A that provides terms and conditions of employment, including coverage under Plan A. In this example, Plan A still meets the criteria for a regulatory finding that it is collectively bargained under section 3(40) of ERISA. Union A's recruitment and representation of a new occupational category of workers unrelated to the construction trade, its promotion of attractive health benefits to achieve organizing success, and the Plan's resultant growth, do not take Plan A outside the regulatory finding.

Example 10. Assume the same facts as in Example 7. The Medical Consortium, a newly formed organization, approaches Plan A with a proposal to make money for Plan A and Union A by enrolling a large group of employers, their employees, and self-employed individuals affiliated with the Medical Consortium. The Medical Consortium obtains employers' signatures on a generic document bearing Union A's name, labeled "collective bargaining agreement," which provides for health coverage under Plan A and compliance with wage and hour statutes, as well as other employment laws. Employees of signatory employers sign enrollment documents for Plan A and are issued membership cards in Union A; their membership dues are regularly checked off along with their monthly payments for health coverage. Self-employed individuals similarly receive union membership cards and make monthly payments, which are divided between Plan A and the Union. Aside from health coverage matters, these new participants have little or no contact with Union A. The new participants enrolled through the Consortium amount to 18% of the population of Plan A during the current Plan Year. In this example, Plan A now fails to meet the criteria in paragraphs (b)(2) and (b)(3) of this section, because more than 15% of its participants are individuals who are not employed under agreements that are the product of a *bona fide* collective bargaining relationship and who do not fall within any of the other nexus categories set forth in paragraph (b)(2) of this section. Moreover, even if the number of additional participants enrolled through the Medical Consortium, together with any other participants who did not fall within any of the nexus categories, did not exceed 15% of the total participant population under the plan, the circumstances in this example would trigger the disqualification of paragraph (c)(2) of this section, because Plan A now is being maintained under a substantial number of agreements that are a "scheme, plan, stratagem or artifice of evasion" intended primarily to evade compliance with state laws and regulations pertaining to insurance.

In either case, the consequence of adding the participants through the Medical Consortium is that Plan A is now a MEWA for purposes of section 3(40) of ERISA and is not exempt from state regulation by virtue of ERISA.

(f) *Cross-reference.* See 29 CFR part 2570, subpart H for procedural rules relating to proceedings seeking an Administrative Law Judge finding by the Secretary under section 3(40) of ERISA.

(g) Effect of proceeding seeking Administrative Law Judge Section 3(40) Finding.

(1) An Administrative Law Judge finding issued pursuant to the procedures in 29 CFR part 2570, subpart H will constitute a finding whether the entity in that proceeding is an employee welfare benefit plan established or maintained under or pursuant to an agreement that the Secretary finds to be a collective bargaining agreement for purposes of section 3(40) of ERISA.

(2) Nothing in this section or in 29 CFR part 2570, subpart H is intended to provide the basis for a stay or delay of a state administrative or court proceeding or enforcement of a subpoena.

Signed this 31st day of March 2003.

Ann L. Combs,

Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-8113 Filed 4-7-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employee Benefits Security Administration

29 CFR Part 2570

RIN 1210-AA48

Procedures for Administrative Hearings Regarding Plans Established or Maintained Pursuant to Collective Bargaining Agreements Under Section 3(40)(A) of ERISA

AGENCY: Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document contains regulations under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, (ERISA or the Act) describing procedures for administrative hearings to obtain a determination by the Secretary of Labor (Secretary) as to whether a particular employee welfare benefit plan is established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements for purposes of section 3(40) of ERISA. An administrative hearing is available

only if the jurisdiction or law of a state has been asserted against a plan or other arrangement that contends it meets the exception for plans established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements. A separate document published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register** contains a rule setting forth the criteria for determining when an employee welfare benefit plan is established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements for purposes of section 3(40) of ERISA. These regulations are intended to assist labor organizations, plan sponsors and state insurance departments in determining whether a plan is a "multiple employer welfare arrangement" within the meaning of section 3(40) of ERISA.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 9, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Elizabeth A. Goodman, Office of Regulations and Interpretations, Employee Benefits Security Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room N-5669, Washington, DC 20210, (202) 693-8510. This is not a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

These final rules set forth an administrative procedure for obtaining a determination by the Secretary of Labor (the Secretary) as to whether a particular employee benefit plan is established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more agreements that are collective bargaining agreements for purposes of section 3(40) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). These rules (the procedural regulations) are being published simultaneously with a final regulation (the criteria regulation) setting forth specific criteria that, if met and if certain other factors set forth in the final regulation are not present, constitute a finding by the Secretary that a plan is established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements for purposes of section 3(40). Both of these final rulemakings take into account the views expressed by the ERISA section 3(40) Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee (the Committee), which was convened by the Department under the Negotiated Rulemaking Act (NRA) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act (the FACA), 5 U.S.C. App. 2. Together, these final regulations will assist states, plan sponsors, and administrators of employee benefit plans, in determining the scope of state regulatory authority

over plans or other arrangements as set forth in sections 3(40) and 514(b)(6) of ERISA.

The procedural rules provide for administrative hearings to obtain a determination by the Secretary as to whether a particular plan is established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements for purposes of section 3(40) of ERISA. The rules are modeled on the procedures set forth in 29 CFR sections 2570.60 through 2570.71 regarding civil penalties under section 502(c)(2) of ERISA related to reports required to be filed under ERISA section 101(b)(1) and are designed to maintain the maximum degree of uniformity with those rules that is consonant with the need for an expedited procedure accommodating the specific characteristics necessary for proceedings under section 3(40). Accordingly, the rules adopt many, although not all, of the provisions of subpart A of 29 CFR part 18 for the 3(40) proceedings. In this regard, it should be noted that the rules apply only to adjudicatory proceedings before administrative law judges (ALJs) of the United States Department of Labor (the Department). An administrative hearing is available under these rules only to an entity that contends it meets the exception provided in section 3(40)(A)(i) for plans established or maintained under or pursuant to collective bargaining agreements and only if the jurisdiction or law of a state has been asserted against that entity.

These procedural rules were published in the **Federal Register** in proposed form on October 27, 2000, (65 FR 64498), simultaneously with the proposed criteria regulation. As discussed more fully in the preamble to the final criteria regulation, the Department received seven comments on the proposed criteria and procedural regulations, only one of which related to the procedural regulations. After considering the views of the Committee, which was reconvened by the Department for that purpose and met in public session on March 1, 2002, the Department has determined to issue the final procedural regulations in the same format and language as proposed.

The Department received only one comment relating to the proposed procedural rules. This comment also concerned the criteria regulation and is discussed in the preamble to that final rule. As described in the preamble to the final criteria regulation, the Department has clarified the language of paragraph (g)(2) of the criteria regulation to emphasize that the ALJ proceedings do not provide a basis for a stay-of-state administrative or judicial proceedings.

The language of the procedural regulations remains unchanged.

B. Economic Analysis Under Executive Order 12866

Under Executive Order 12866, the Department must determine whether a regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to the requirements of the Executive Order and subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under section 3(f), the order defines a "significant regulatory action" as an action that is likely to result in a rule (1) Having an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, or adversely and materially affecting a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local or tribal governments or communities (also referred to as "economically significant"); (2) creating serious inconsistency or otherwise interfering with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially altering the budgetary impacts of entitlement grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) raising novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

Pursuant to the terms of the Executive Order, it has been determined that this action is "significant" within the meaning of 3(f)(4), and therefore subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Consistent with the Executive Order, the Department has undertaken an assessment of the costs and benefits of this regulatory action. The analysis is detailed below.

Summary

Pursuant to the requirements of Executive Order 12866, at the time of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the Department sought comments and information from the public on its analysis of the benefits and costs of the proposed regulation. Having received none, the Department believes, based on its original discussion, that the benefits of this final regulation justify its costs. The regulation will benefit plans, states, insurers, and organized labor by reducing the cost of resolving some disputes over a state's right to regulate certain multiple employer welfare benefit arrangements, facilitating the conduct of hearings, reducing disputes over a plan or arrangement's status, and improving the efficiency and ensuring the consistency in determinations of such jurisdiction.

Background

When state law or jurisdiction is asserted over an entity that claims to be excepted from state regulation under the collective bargaining exception, the entity has the option of using these procedures to resolve the dispute. In the absence of the procedure provided under these regulations for determining whether a given plan or arrangement is established or maintained pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, such disputes have generally been resolved in courts. The Department believes that resolving disputes through the procedures established by these regulations will generally be more efficient and less costly than resolving the disputes in a court of law. Also, determinations made in the single, specialized venue of administrative hearings are likely to be more consistent than determinations made in multiple, non-specialized court venues.

Benefits of the Regulation

The procedure established by these regulations will complement the criteria established by the criteria regulation. Together, the regulations will assist in accurately identifying MEWAs and collectively bargained plans and ensure that disputes over such classifications are resolved efficiently. For purposes of its assessment of the economic impact of the regulations, the Department has attributed the net benefits of ensuring accurate determinations to the criteria regulation. It has attributed the net benefits of ensuring efficient resolution of disputes to these procedural regulations.

Determining Jurisdiction Accurately and Consistently

The criteria regulation will reduce existing confusion about whether an entity falls under the collective bargaining agreement exception. However, given the wide variety of agreements, plans and arrangements, as well as the potential for conflicting determinations where a MEWA is conducting business in more than one state, some uncertainties might remain. The Department has therefore established a procedure for obtaining an individualized hearing before a Department of Labor ALJ and for final appeals to the Secretary or the Secretary's delegate to determine an entity's legal status.

Employers and employees will benefit from an administrative decision that provides greater assurance that the entity will comply with applicable federal and state laws designed to protect welfare benefits. In addition,

both the petitioner and the state whose authority is being asserted will benefit from the uniform application of criteria by the ALJ, avoiding any confusion that would result from inconsistent decisions. Finally, state insurance departments that receive a timely resolution about an entity's status as a MEWA will be able to swiftly deal with sham MEWAs and then re-direct saved resources to other areas. Because an ALJ decision will be based on the criteria regulation, the Department has attributed the net benefit from the reclassification of currently inaccurately classified plans or arrangements (and the consequent application of appropriate state or federal protections) to that regulation.

Resolving Disputes Efficiently

An administrative hearing under the final regulations will economically benefit the small number of plans or arrangements that dispute state assertion of law or jurisdiction. The Department foresees improved efficiencies through use of administrative hearings that are at the option of entities over which state jurisdiction has been asserted. An administrative hearing allows the various parties to obtain a decision in a timely, efficient, and less costly manner than is usual in federal or state court proceedings, thus benefiting employers and employees.

The Department's analysis of costs involved in adjudication in a federal or state court versus an administrative hearing assumes that parties seeking to establish regulatory authority incur a baseline cost to resolve the question of status in federal or state court proceeding. This baseline cost includes, but is not limited to, expenditures for document production, attorney fees, filing fees, depositions, etc. Because regulatory authority may be decided in motions or pleadings in cases where that issue is not primary, the direct cost of using only the courts as a decision-maker for such issues is too variable to specify; however, custom and practice indicate that the cost of an administrative hearing is similar to or represents a cost savings compared with the baseline cost of litigating in federal or state court.

Because the procedures and evidentiary rules of an administrative hearing generally track the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and of Evidence, document production is similar for both an administrative hearing and for a federal or state court proceeding. Documents such as by-laws, administrative agreements, collective bargaining agreements, and other

documents and instruments governing the entity are generally kept in the normal course of business, and it is likely that the cost for an administrative hearing will be no more than that which would be incurred in preparation for litigation in a federal or state court. Certain administrative hearing practices and other new procedures initiated by this regulation may, however, represent a cost savings over litigation. For example, neither party need employ an attorney; the prehearing exchange is short and general; either party may move to shorten the time for the scheduling of a proceeding, including the time for conducting discovery; the general formality of the hearing may vary, particularly depending on whether the petitioner is appearing *pro se*; an expedited hearing is possible; and, the ALJ generally has 30 days after receipt of the transcript of an oral hearing or after the filing of all documentary evidence if no oral hearing is conducted to reach a decision.

The Department cannot predict that any or all of these conditions will exist, nor can it predict that any of these factors represent a cost-savings. However, it is likely that the specialized knowledge of ERISA that the ALJ will bring to the process will facilitate a prompt decision, reduce costs, and introduce a consistent standard to what has been a confusion of decisions on regulatory authority. ALJ case histories will educate MEWAs and states by articulating the characteristics of a collectively bargained plan, which clarity will in turn promote compliance with appropriate federal and state regulations. Participants and beneficiaries of arrangements that are newly identified as MEWAs will especially benefit from appropriate state oversight that provides for secure contributions and paid-up claims. In its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the Department solicited comments on the comparative cost of a trial in federal or state court versus an administrative hearing on the issue of whether an entity is a plan is established or maintained under or pursuant to an agreement or agreements that the Secretary finds to be collective bargaining agreements for purposes of section 3(40) of ERISA. No comments concerning the comparative costs of a trial versus an administrative hearing were received.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) (RFA) imposes certain requirements with respect to Federal rules that are subject to the notice and comment requirements of

section 553(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 551 *et seq.*) and that are likely to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Unless an agency certifies that a proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, section 604 of the RFA requires that the agency present a final regulatory flexibility analysis at the time of the publication of the notice of final rulemaking describing the impact of the rule on small entities. Small entities include small businesses, organizations, and governmental jurisdictions.

For purposes of analysis under the RFA, EBSA continues to consider a small entity to be an employee benefit plan with fewer than 100 participants. The basis of this definition is found in section 104(a)(2) of ERISA, which permits the Secretary of Labor to prescribe simplified annual reports for pension plans that cover fewer than 100 participants. Under section 104(a)(3), the Secretary may also provide for exemptions or simplified annual reporting and disclosure for welfare benefit plans. Pursuant to the authority of section 104(a)(3), the Department has previously issued at 29 CFR 2520.104-20, 2520.104-21, 2520.104-41, 2520.104-46 and 2520.104b-10 certain simplified reporting provisions and limited exemptions from reporting and disclosure requirements for small plans, including unfunded or insured welfare benefit plans covering fewer than 100 participants and which satisfy certain other requirements.

Further, while some large employers may have small plans, in general most small plans are maintained by small employers. Thus, EBSA believes that assessing the impact of this final rule on small plans is an appropriate substitute for evaluating the effect on small entities. The definition of small entity considered appropriate for this purpose differs, however, from a definition of small business that is based on size standards promulgated by the Small Business Administration (SBA) (13 CFR 121.201) pursuant to the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 *et seq.*). In its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, EBSA requested comments on the appropriateness of the size standard used; no comments were received.

On this basis, EBSA has determined that this rule does not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. In support of this determination, and in an effort to provide a sound basis for this conclusion, EBSA has prepared the following final regulatory flexibility analysis.

(1) *Reason for the Action.* The Department is establishing a procedure for an administrative hearing so that states and entities will be able to obtain a determination by the Secretary as to whether a particular employee welfare benefit plan is established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements for purposes of an exception to section 3(40) of ERISA.

(2) *Objectives.* The objective of these regulations is to make available to plans an individualized procedure for obtaining a hearing before a Department of Labor ALJ, and for appeals of an ALJ decision to the Secretary or the Secretary's delegate. The procedure is appropriate for the resolution of a dispute regarding an entity's legal status in situations where the jurisdiction or law of a state has been asserted against a plan that contends it meets the exception for plans established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements.

(3) *Estimate of Small Entities Affected.* For purposes of this discussion, the Department has deemed a small entity to be an employee benefit plan with fewer than 100 participants. No small governmental jurisdictions are affected.

Based on Form 5500 filings and Form M-1 filings by MEWAs pursuant to interim final rules published in the **Federal Register** on February 11, 2000 (65 FR 7152), it is estimated that there about 2,600 entities that can be classified as either collectively bargained plans or as MEWAs; however, EBSA believes that a very small number of these arrangements will have fewer than 100 participants. By their nature, the affected arrangements must involve at least two employers, which decreases the likelihood of coverage of fewer than 100 participants. Also, underlying goals of the formation of these arrangements, such as gaining purchasing and negotiating power through economies of scale, improving administrative efficiencies, and gaining access to additional benefit design features, are not readily accomplished if the group of covered lives remains small.

The number of small plans found within the group of 2,600 collectively bargained plans or MEWAs is about 200, or eight percent. The Employee Benefits Supplement to the 1993 Current Population Survey and a 1993 Small Business Administration survey of retirement and other benefit coverages in small firms indicate that there are more than 2.5 million private group health plans with fewer than 100 participants. Thus, the 200 small entities potentially affected represent a

very small portion of all small group health plans. Even if all 2,600 potentially affected entities were to have fewer than 100 participants, they would represent approximately one-tenth of one percent of all small group health plans.

The Department is not aware of any source of information indicating the number of instances in which state law or jurisdiction has been asserted over these entities, or the portion of those instances that involved the collective bargaining agreement exception. However, in order to develop an estimate of the number of plans or arrangements that might seek to clarify their legal status by using an administrative hearing as proposed by these regulations, the Department examined the number of lawsuits to which the Department had previously been a party. While this number is not viewed as a measure of the incidence of the assertion of state jurisdiction, it is considered the only reasonable available proxy for an estimate of a maximum number of instances in which the applicability of state requirements might be at issue.

In recent years, the Department has been a party to an average of 45 legal actions annually. The proportion of these lawsuits that involved a dispute over state jurisdiction based on a plan's or an arrangement's legal status is unknown. On the whole, 45 is therefore considered a reasonable estimate of an upper bound number of plans that could have been a party to a lawsuit involving a determination of the plan's legal status. Because this procedural regulation and the related criteria regulation are expected to reduce the number of disputes, the Department assumes that 45 represents a conservatively high estimate of the number of plans or arrangements that would petition for an administrative hearing. Of all small plans and arrangements, then, the greatest number of plans or arrangements likely to petition for an administrative hearing represents a tiny fraction of the total number of small plans.

In addition, the Department has assumed that an entity's exercise of the opportunity to petition for a finding will generally be less costly than available alternatives. Accordingly, the Department has concluded that these regulations will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

(4) *Reporting and Recordkeeping.* In most cases, the records that will be used to support a petition for a hearing pursuant to these procedures will be maintained by plans and MEWAs in the

ordinary course of their business. Certain documents, such as affidavits, would likely be required to be prepared specifically for purposes of the petition. It is assumed that documents will most often be assembled and drafted by attorneys, although this is not required by the express terms of the procedure.

(5) *Duplication*. No federal rules have been identified that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the final rule.

(6) *Alternatives*. The regulations are based on the consensus report of the Committee. Recognizing that guidance was needed in clarifying collective bargaining exceptions to the MEWA regulation, in 1995, the Department had published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Plans Established or Maintained Under or Pursuant to Collective Bargaining Agreements in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 39209). Under the terms of the 1995 NPRM, it would have been within the authority of state insurance regulators to identify and regulate MEWAs operating in their jurisdictions. The 1995 proposal did not establish a method for obtaining individual findings by the Department.

The Department received numerous comments on the NPRM expressing concerns about plans' abilities to meet the standards set forth in the NPRM. Commenters also objected to granting authority to state regulators for determining whether a particular agreement was a collective bargaining agreement. Commenters strongly preferred that determination of whether a plan was established under or pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement lie with a federal agency and not with individual states.

Based on the comments received, the Department turned to negotiated rulemaking as an appropriate method of developing a revised Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. In September 1998, the Secretary established the Committee under the NRA. The Committee membership was chosen from the organizations that submitted comments on the Department's August 1995 NPRM and from the petitions and nominations for membership received in response to a Department Notice of Intent. These regulations are based on the Committee's consensus on the need for an individualized administrative proceeding in limited circumstances for determining the legal status of an entity. Based on the fact that the Committee represented a cross section of the state, federal, association, and private sector insurance organizations concerned with these issues, the Department believes that, as an alternative to the 1995 NPRM, these regulations accomplish the stated objectives of the Secretary and

will have a beneficial effect on MEWAs, state insurance regulators, small employers who offer group health coverage, and plan participants. No other significant alternatives that would minimize the economic impact on small entities have been identified.

Participating in an administrative hearing to determine legal status is a voluntary undertaking on the part of a plan or arrangement. It would be inappropriate to create an exemption for small entities under the regulation because small entities are as much in need of clarification of their legal status as are larger entities.

D. Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA 95) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Department submitted the information collection request (ICR) included in the Procedures for Administrative Hearings Regarding Plans Established or Maintained Pursuant to Collective Bargaining Agreements under section 3(40)(A) of ERISA to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance at the time the NPRM was published in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 64498). A request for comments on the ICR was included in the NPRM. No comments were received about the ICR, and no changes have been made to the ICR in connection with this Notice of Final Rulemaking. OMB subsequently approved the ICR under control number 1210-0119. The approval will expire on January 31, 2004.

Agency: Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor.

Title: Petition for Finding under section 3(40) of ERISA.

OMB Number: 1210-0119.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit; not-for-profit institutions.

Respondents: 45.

Responses: 45.

Average Time Per Response: 32 hours.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 1.

Estimated Total Burden Cost (Operating and Maintenance): \$104,100.

E. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

The rule being issued here is subject to the Congressional Review Act provisions of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*) and has been transmitted to Congress and the Comptroller General for review. The rule is not a "major rule" as that term is defined in 5 U.S.C. 804, because it is not likely to result in (1) An annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; (2) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual

industries, or federal, state, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or (3) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

F. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

For purposes of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*), as well as Executive Order 12875, this proposed rule does not include any federal mandate that may result in expenditures by state, local, or tribal governments, or the private sector, which may impose an annual burden of \$100 million.

G. Executive Order 13132

When an agency promulgates a regulation that has federalism implications, Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, Aug. 10, 1999) requires the Agency to provide a federalism summary impact statement. Pursuant to section 6(c) of the Order, such a statement must include a description of the extent of the agency's consultation with State and local officials, a summary of the nature of their concerns and the agency's position supporting the need to issue the regulation, and a statement of the extent to which the concerns of the State have been met.

This regulation has Federalism implications because it sets forth standards and procedures for an ALJ hearing for determining whether certain entities may be regulated under certain state laws or whether such state laws are preempted with respect to such entities. The state laws at issue are those that regulate the business of insurance. A member of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC), representing the interest of state governments in the regulation of insurance, participated in the negotiations throughout the negotiated rulemaking process that provided the basis for this regulation.

In response to comments from the public about the proposed rule, the NAIC raised a concern that the process by which the Department issues ALJ determinations regarding the collectively bargained status of entities should move forward as quickly as possible and not result in a stay of state enforcement proceedings against MEWAs. The final regulation specifically states that the proceedings shall be conducted as expeditiously as possible and that the parties shall make every effort to avoid delay at each stage of the proceeding. The companion

regulation that establishes criteria for determining whether an employee benefit plan is established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements for purposes of section 3(40) of ERISA provides that ALJ proceedings under this regulation are not intended to provide the basis for a stay or delay of a state administrative or court proceeding or enforcement of a subpoena.

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 2570

Administrative practice and procedure, Claims, Employee benefit plans, Government employees, Law enforcement, Penalties, Pensions, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

■ For the reasons set out in the preamble, Part 2570 of Chapter XXV of Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended to read as follows:

PART 2570—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 2570 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 8477, 29 U.S.C. 1002(40), 1021, 1108, 1132, 1135; sec. 102, Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1978, 43 FR 47713, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp. p. 332, and E.O. 12108, 44 FR 1065, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 275; Secretary of Labor's Order 1–2003, 68 FR 5374 (Feb. 3, 2003).

■ 2. Add new Subpart H to read as follows:

Subpart H—Procedures for Issuance of Findings Under ERISA Sec. 3(40)

Sec.	
2570.150	Scope of rules.
2570.151	In general.
2570.152	Definitions.
2570.153	Parties.
2570.154	Filing and contents of petition.
2570.155	Service.
2570.156	Expedited proceedings.
2570.157	Allocation of burden of proof.
2570.158	Decision of the Administrative Law Judge.
2570.159	Review by the Secretary.

§ 2570.150 Scope of rules.

The rules of practice set forth in this subpart H apply to “section 3(40) Finding Proceedings” (as defined in § 2570.152(g)), under section 3(40) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA or the Act). Refer to 29 CFR 2510.3–40 for the definition of relevant terms of section 3(40) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. 1002(40). To the extent that the regulations in this subpart differ from the regulations in subpart A of 29 CFR part 18, the regulations in this subpart apply to matters arising under section 3(40) of ERISA rather than the rules of procedure for administrative hearings

published by the Department's Office of Administrative Law Judges in subpart A of 29 CFR part 18. These proceedings shall be conducted as expeditiously as possible, and the parties shall make every effort to avoid delay at each stage of the proceedings.

§ 2570.151 In general.

If there is an attempt to assert state jurisdiction or the application of state law, either by the issuance of a state administrative or court subpoena to, or the initiation of administrative or judicial proceedings against, a plan or other arrangement that alleges it is covered by title I of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. 1003, the plan or other arrangement may petition the Secretary to make a finding under section 3(40)(A)(i) of ERISA that it is a plan established or maintained under or pursuant to an agreement or agreements that the Secretary finds to be collective bargaining agreements for purposes of section 3(40) of ERISA.

§ 2570.152 Definitions.

For section 3(40) Finding Proceedings, this section shall apply instead of the definitions in 29 CFR 18.2.

(a) *ERISA* means the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, *et seq.*, 29 U.S.C. 1001, *et seq.*, as amended.

(b) *Order* means the whole or part of a final procedural or substantive disposition by the administrative law judge of a matter under section 3(40) of ERISA. No order will be appealable to the Secretary except as provided in this subpart.

(c) *Petition* means a written request under the procedures in this subpart for a finding by the Secretary under section 3(40) of ERISA that a plan is established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements.

(d) *Petitioner* means the plan or arrangement filing a petition.

(e) *Respondent* means:

(1) A state government instrumentality charged with enforcing the law that is alleged to apply or which has been identified as asserting jurisdiction over a plan or other arrangement, including any agency, commission, board, or committee charged with investigating and enforcing state insurance laws, including parties joined under § 2570.153;

(2) The person or entity asserting that state law or state jurisdiction applies to the petitioner;

(3) The Secretary of Labor; and

(4) A state not named in the petition that has intervened under § 2570.153(b).

(f) *Secretary* means the Secretary of Labor, and includes, pursuant to any delegation or sub-delegation of authority, the Assistant Secretary for Employee Benefits Security or other employee of the Employee Benefits Security Administration.

(g) *Section 3(40) Finding Proceeding* means a proceeding before the Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ) relating to whether the Secretary finds an entity to be a plan to be established or maintained under or pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements within the meaning of section 3(40) of ERISA.

§ 2570.153 Parties.

For section 3(40) Finding Proceedings, this section shall apply instead of 29 CFR 18.10.

(a) The term “party” with respect to a Section 3(40) Finding Proceeding means the petitioner and the respondents.

(b) States not named in the petition may participate as parties in a Section 3(40) Finding Proceeding by notifying the OALJ and the other parties in writing prior to the date for filing a response to the petition. After the date for service of responses to the petition, a state not named in the petition may intervene as a party only with the consent of all parties or as otherwise ordered by the ALJ.

(c) The Secretary of Labor shall be named as a “respondent” to all actions.

(d) The failure of any party to comply with any order of the ALJ may, at the discretion of the ALJ, result in the denial of the opportunity to present evidence in the proceeding.

§ 2570.154 Filing and contents of petition.

(a) A person seeking a finding under section 3(40) of ERISA must file a written petition by delivering or mailing it to the Chief Docket Clerk, Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ), 800 K Street, NW., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20001–8002, or by making a filing by any electronic means permitted under procedures established by the OALJ.

(b) The petition shall—

(1) Provide the name and address of the entity for which the petition is filed;

(2) Provide the names and addresses of the plan administrator and plan sponsor(s) of the plan or other arrangement for which the finding is sought;

(3) Identify the state or states whose law or jurisdiction the petitioner claims has been asserted over the petitioner, and provide the addresses and names of responsible officials;

(4) Include affidavits or other written evidence showing that:

(i) State jurisdiction has been asserted over or legal process commenced against the petitioner pursuant to state law;

(ii) The petitioner is an employee welfare benefit plan as defined at section 3(1) of ERISA (29 U.S.C. 1002(1)) and 29 CFR 2510.3-1 and is covered by title I of ERISA (*see* 29 U.S.C. 1003);

(iii) The petitioner is established or maintained for the purpose of offering or providing benefits described in section 3(1) of ERISA (29 U.S.C. 1002(1)) to employees of two or more employers (including one or more self-employed individuals) or their beneficiaries;

(iv) The petitioner satisfies the criteria in 29 CFR 2510.3-40(b); and

(v) Service has been made as provided in § 2570.155.

(5) The affidavits shall set forth such facts as would be admissible in evidence in a proceeding under 29 CFR part 18 and shall show affirmatively that the affiant is competent to testify to the matters stated therein. The affidavit or other written evidence must set forth specific facts showing the factors required under paragraph (b)(4) of this section.

§ 2570.155 Service.

For section 3(40) proceedings, this section shall apply instead of 29 CFR 18.3.

(a) *In general.* Copies of all documents shall be served on all parties of record. All documents should clearly designate the docket number, if any, and short title of all matters. All documents to be filed shall be delivered or mailed to the Chief Docket Clerk, Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ), 800 K Street, NW., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20001-8002, or to the OALJ Regional Office to which the proceeding may have been transferred for hearing. Each document filed shall be clear and legible.

(b) *By parties.* All motions, petitions, pleadings, briefs, or other documents shall be filed with the Office of Administrative Law Judges with a copy, including any attachments, to all other parties of record. When a party is represented by an attorney, service shall be made upon the attorney. Service of any document upon any party may be made by personal delivery or by mailing by first class, prepaid U.S. mail, a copy to the last known address. The Secretary shall be served by delivery to the Associate Solicitor, Plan Benefits Security Division, ERISA Section 3(40) Proceeding, PO Box 1914, Washington, DC 20013. The person serving the

document shall certify to the manner and date of service.

(c) *By the Office of Administrative Law Judges.* Service of orders, decisions and all other documents shall be made to all parties of record by regular mail to their last known address.

(d) *Form of pleadings.* (1) Every pleading shall contain information indicating the name of the Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA) as the agency under which the proceeding is instituted, the title of the proceeding, the docket number (if any) assigned by the OALJ and a designation of the type of pleading or paper (*e.g.*, notice, motion to dismiss, *etc.*). The pleading or paper shall be signed and shall contain the address and telephone number of the party or person representing the party. Although there are no formal specifications for documents, they should be typewritten when possible on standard size 8½ x 11 inch paper.

(2) Illegible documents, whether handwritten, typewritten, photocopies, or otherwise, will not be accepted. Papers may be reproduced by any duplicating process provided all copies are clear and legible.

§ 2570.156 Expedited proceedings.

For section 3(40) Finding Proceedings, this section shall apply instead of 29 CFR 18.42.

(a) At any time after commencement of a proceeding, any party may move to advance the scheduling of a proceeding, including the time for conducting discovery.

(b) Except when such proceedings are directed by the Chief Administrative Law Judge or the administrative law judge assigned, any party filing a motion under this section shall:

(1) Make the motion in writing;

(2) Describe the circumstances justifying advancement;

(3) Describe the irreparable harm that would result if the motion is not granted; and

(4) Incorporate in the motion affidavits to support any representations of fact.

(c) Service of a motion under this section shall be accomplished by personal delivery, or by facsimile, followed by first class, prepaid, U.S. mail. Service is complete upon personal delivery or mailing.

(d) Except when such proceedings are required, or unless otherwise directed by the Chief Administrative Law Judge or the administrative law judge assigned, all parties to the proceeding in which the motion is filed shall have ten (10) days from the date of service of the

motion to file an opposition in response to the motion.

(e) Following the timely receipt by the administrative law judge of statements in response to the motion, the administrative law judge may advance pleading schedules, discovery schedules, prehearing conferences, and the hearing, as deemed appropriate; provided, however, that a hearing on the merits shall not be scheduled with less than five (5) working days notice to the parties, unless all parties consent to an earlier hearing.

(f) When an expedited hearing is held, the decision of the administrative law judge shall be issued within twenty (20) days after receipt of the transcript of any oral hearing or within twenty (20) days after the filing of all documentary evidence if no oral hearing is conducted.

§ 2570.157 Allocation of burden of proof.

For purposes of a final decision under § 2570.158 (Decision of the Administrative Law Judge) or § 2570.159 (Review by the Secretary), the petitioner shall have the burden of proof as to whether it meets 29 CFR 2510.3-40.

§ 2570.158 Decision of the Administrative Law Judge.

For section 3(40) finding proceedings, this section shall apply instead of 29 CFR 18.57.

(a) *Proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and order.* Within twenty (20) days of filing the transcript of the testimony, or such additional time as the administrative law judge may allow, each party may file with the administrative law judge, subject to the judge's discretion under 29 CFR 18.55, proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and order together with the supporting brief expressing the reasons for such proposals. Such proposals and brief shall be served on all parties, and shall refer to all portions of the record and to all authorities relied upon in support of each proposal.

(b) *Decision based on oral argument in lieu of briefs.* In any case in which the administrative law judge believes that written briefs or proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law may not be necessary, the administrative law judge shall notify the parties at the opening of the hearing or as soon thereafter as is practicable that he or she may wish to hear oral argument in lieu of briefs. The administrative law judge shall issue his or her decision at the close of oral argument, or within 30 days thereafter.

(c) *Decision of the administrative law judge.* Within 30 days, or as soon as

possible thereafter, after the time allowed for the filing of the proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and order, or within thirty (30) days after receipt of an agreement containing consent findings and order disposing of the disputed matter in whole, the administrative law judge shall make his or her decision. The decision of the administrative law judge shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law, with reasons therefore, upon each material issue of fact or law presented on the record. The decision of the administrative law judge shall be based upon the whole record. It shall be supported by reliable and probative evidence. Such decision shall be in accordance with the regulations found at 29 CFR 2510.3-40 and shall be limited to whether the petitioner, based on the facts presented at the time of the

proceeding, is a plan established or maintained under or pursuant to collective bargaining for the purposes of section 3(40) of ERISA.

§ 2570.159 Review by the Secretary.

(a) A request for review by the Secretary of an appealable decision of the administrative law judge may be made by any party. Such a request must be filed within 20 days of the issuance of the final decision or the final decision of the administrative law judge will become the final agency order for purposes of 5 U.S.C. 701 *et seq.*

(b) A request for review by the Secretary shall state with specificity the issue(s) in the administrative law judge's final decision upon which review is sought. The request shall be served on all parties to the proceeding.

(c) The review by the Secretary shall not be a de novo proceeding but rather

a review of the record established by the administrative law judge.

(d) The Secretary may, in his or her discretion, allow the submission of supplemental briefs by the parties to the proceeding.

(e) The Secretary shall issue a decision as promptly as possible, affirming, modifying, or setting aside, in whole or in part, the decision under review, and shall set forth a brief statement of reasons therefor. Such decision by the Secretary shall be the final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 704.

Signed this 31st day of March, 2003.

Ann L. Combs,

Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-8114 Filed 4-7-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-P