



In the Matter of:

JOHN JONES, JR.

ARB CASE NO. 97-076

COMPLAINANT,

ALJ CASE NO. 96-SWD-3

v.

DATE: March 31, 1997

**ASHTABULA TOWNSHIP
PARK COMMISSION,**

RESPONDENT.

BEFORE: THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW BOARD^{1/}

**FINAL ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT
AND DISMISSING COMPLAINT**

This case arises under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA), 42 U.S.C. § 6971 (1988). The parties submitted a Settlement Agreement seeking approval of the settlement and dismissal of the complaint. The Administrative Law Judge issued a Recommended Decision and Order on March 14, 1997 approving the settlement.

The request for approval is based on an agreement entered into by the parties, therefore, we must review it to determine whether the terms are a fair, adequate and reasonable settlement of the complaint. 29 C.F.R. § 24.6. *Macktal v. Secretary of Labor*, 923 F.2d 1150, 1153-54 (5th Cir. 1991); *Thompson v. U.S. Dep't of Labor*, 885 F.2d 551, 556 (9th Cir. 1989); *Fuchko and Yunker v. Georgia Power Co.*, Case Nos. 89-ERA-9, 89-ERA-10, Sec. Order, Mar. 23, 1989, slip op. at 1-2.

Paragraph 2 of the agreement could be construed as a waiver by Complainant of any causes of action he may have which arise in the future. As the Secretary has held in prior cases, *see Johnson v. Transco Products, Inc.*, Case No. 85-ERA-7, Sec. Ord., Aug. 8, 1985, such a provision

^{1/} On April 17, 1996, a Secretary's Order was signed delegating jurisdiction to issue final agency decisions under this statute to the newly created Administrative Review Board. 61 Fed. Reg. 19978 (May 3, 1996). Secretary's Order 2-96 contains a comprehensive list of the statutes, executive order, and regulations under which the Administrative Review Board now issues final agency decisions. Final procedural revisions to the regulations implementing this reorganization were also promulgated on that date. 61 Fed. Reg. 19982.

must be interpreted as limited to the right to sue in the future on claims or causes of action arising out of facts or any set of facts occurring before the date of the agreement. *See also Alexander v. Gardner-Denver Co.*, 415 U.S. 36, 51-52 (1974); *Rogers v. General Electric Co.*, 781 F.2d 452, 454 (5th Cir. 1986).

The Board requires that all parties requesting settlement approval of cases arising under the SWDA provide the settlement documentation for any other alleged claims arising from the same factual circumstances forming the basis of the federal claim, or to certify that no other such settlement agreements were entered into between the parties. *Biddy v. Alyeska Pipeline Service Company*, ARB Case Nos. 96-109, 97-015, Final Order Approving Settlement and Dismissing Complaint, Dec. 3, 1996, slip op. at 3. Accordingly, the parties have certified that the agreement constitutes the entire and only settlement agreement with respect to the complainant's claims.

We find that the agreement, as so construed, is a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of the complaint. Accordingly, we APPROVE the agreement and DISMISS THE COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE.

SO ORDERED.

DAVID A. O'BRIEN
Chair

KARL J. SANDSTROM
Member

JOYCE D. MILLER
Alternate Member