

Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001.
Telephone: (301) 415-1703; FAX: (301)
415-2162; Internet: JLB@NRC.GOV.

Background

As part of the Government Performance and Results Act, the NRC is required to update its strategic plan triennially. The NRC's first strategic plan was issued in September 1997. Since that time, the NRC has implemented a Planning, Budgeting and Performance Measurement (PBPM) process which focuses on becoming more performance-based and outcome-oriented. The Nuclear Reactor Safety Chapter of the NRC Strategic Plan reflects this approach to long-range planning, as well as institutionalizing regulatory reforms that have been initiated within the last 18 months. The Nuclear Reactor Safety chapter has progressed to a point that further improvement will be enhanced by stakeholder input.

In the Fall of 1997 the agency undertook an effort to review and revise its strategic plan to better align and link the goals and strategies and to improve the logic and functionality of the strategic plan. The revision, however, did not fully consider the issues raised during the NRC's July 30, 1998, hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety; the July 17, 1998, Commission meeting with stakeholders; the Chairman's August 7, 1998, tasking memorandum; or the progress achieved to make NRC planning and budgeting more outcome-oriented. Since that time, the agency has begun an internal review to address these issues. This has resulted in a draft of selected portions of the strategic plan.

The draft of the Strategic Plan reflects revisions that focus on the Nuclear Reactor Safety arena and reflects the progress to date. Updates to this plan reflect changes in Commission policy over the past year, stakeholder input, as well as the development of new performance goals and measures. Also included in this package are edits to the front end sections that describe the Agency's mission, strategic goals, management goals, and strategic arenas. The Nuclear Reactor Safety Chapter reflects the new focus on four performance goals and the key strategies to be used to achieve these goals. Once completed, this chapter will be used as a model to revise and finalize the other program arena chapters.

This draft of the strategic plan is intended to reflect the results from the change process which has occurred over the past 18 months and which continues

at the NRC. It also describes how this paradigm shift will become an integral part of NRC's future planning, budgeting, and performance management. A schedule to facilitate dialogue among the Commission staff, stakeholders, and Congress is provided below:

Revisions to the Nuclear Reactor Safety (NRS) Chapter of the Strategic Plan

August 3: Issue draft NRS chapter to stakeholders for comment

August 20: Stakeholder Workshop on NRS chapter

Early September: Revised NRS chapter to Commission

Late September: Senate Oversight hearing

The remaining Strategic Plan chapters (Nuclear Materials Safety, Nuclear Waste Safety, International Nuclear Safety Support) will be revised over the next year.

Stakeholder Input to the NRS Chapter of the Strategic Plan

While NRC recognizes work is yet to be finished, further improvements to the draft Strategic Plan will benefit from stakeholder input. The NRC is particularly interested in stakeholder views on the four performance goals and their associated measures and strategies. The draft specifically identifies a number of performance measures for which stakeholder input will be especially useful.

Stakeholder input is requested on the following broad areas:

- Do strategic goals, management goals, and performance goals address the appropriate areas requiring emphasis?
- Are the strategies to achieve these goals adequate to achieve success?
- Are the performance measures adequate to indicate whether we are achieving our goals? Are there better measures?
- Do goals and strategies reflect NRC's commitment to institutionalize change and become more performance based?

August 20, 1999 Workshop

NRC will be conducting a public workshop on August 10, 1999 at 1:00 p.m. in Rockville, Maryland, in the Commission Hearing Room to discuss the Nuclear Reactor Safety Chapter of the Strategic Plan. The NRC staff will answer questions and receive comments. Members of the public are invited to attend. Those wishing to participate in discussions are urged to contact Jim Blaha at 301-415-1703 to facilitate agenda planning.

In addition to participating in the workshop, stakeholders may submit written comments on the draft of the Strategic Plan to the NRC. Comments are requested by August 27, 1999. The draft Strategic Plan, as well as the ability to provide comments electronically, are available on the NRC web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/COMMISSION/INITIATIVES/1999/index.html>. Comments may also be provided in writing to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Debra J. Corley, Mail Stop O-16E15, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001.

Stakeholder comments will be considered in another update of the draft Nuclear Reactor Safety chapter. This update will be provided to the Commission and made publically available prior to our Senate oversight hearing planned for September 1999. Stakeholders will also have other opportunities to comment on the NRC Strategic Plan which is required to be submitted to Congress by September 2000 in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act.

The NRC is accessible to the White Flint Metro Station. Visitor parking near the NRC buildings is limited.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of August, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Frank J. Miraglia, Jr.,
Deputy Executive Director for Regulatory Programs, Office of Executive Director for Operations.

[FR Doc. 99-20910 Filed 8-11-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Proposed Information Collection Activities OMB Circular A-21; Request for Comments

AGENCY: Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) invites comment on the proposed information request. This request proposes a standard format for submitting facilities and administrative rate proposals by educational institutions and will be required by OMB Circular A-21, "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions." The standard format would assist institutions in completing their proposals more efficiently and help the

Federal cognizant agency review each proposal on a more consistent basis. OMB proposed the use of and solicited input on the use of such a form in its proposed revision to OMB Circular A-21 on September 10, 1997. OMB received 35 comments from Federal agencies, universities and professional organizations in response to that section of the proposed revision to Circular A-21. All commenters were in favor of the development of such a form. OMB, with assistance from Federal agencies and universities, developed the attached form for inclusion in Circular A-21. OMB also proposes to revise Circular A-21 as shown below, to incorporate the new form.

DATES: Comments are due on or before October 12, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to Gilbert Tran, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW, Room 6025, Washington, DC 20503. Comments up to three pages in length may be submitted via facsimile to 202-395-4915. Electronic mail comments may be submitted via Internet to Hai—M.—

Tran@omb.eop.gov. Please include the full body of electronic mail comments in the text and not as an attachment. Please include the name, title, organization, postal address, and E-mail address in the text of the message.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gilbert Tran, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget, (202) 395-3993.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OMB proposed on September 10, 1997 (62 FR 47721), to develop a standard format for the submission of facilities and administrative (F&A) proposals, that would assist educational institutions in completing their F&A proposals more

efficiently and help the Federal cognizant agency review each proposal on a more consistent basis. It would also facilitate the Federal Government's effort to collect better information regarding educational institution F&A costs that could be useful in explaining variations in F&A rates among institutions. In addition, a standard format may allow electronic submission of F&A proposals to the Federal cognizant agency in the future.

Federal agencies, universities and professional organizations, through their submitted comments, favorably support the proposal for the development of a standard format. Accordingly, OMB, with the assistance from Federal agencies and university representatives, developed a standard format that includes two parts:

- A summary schedule of the institution's proposed F&A rates, along with the F&A cost pools and their allocations, and
- A listing of support documentation to be submitted with an F&A proposal.

OMB is proposing, through this notice, to include the standard format as Appendix C of the Circular. This notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected entities concerning the proposed information collection to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) 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 technique of other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

This notice also lists the following information:

Title: Appendix C, "OMB Circular A-21 Documentation Requirements for Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Proposals Claiming Costs Under the Regular Method".

Type of review: New collection.

Respondents: Large Universities.

Number of Responses: 282.

Estimated Time Per Response: 4 hours.

Needs and Uses: The proposed form will standardize the documentation requirements for facilities and administrative proposals submitted by large universities to their cognizant agency.

Issued in Washington, DC, August 4, 1999.

Norwood J. Jackson, Jr.,

Acting Controller.

OMB proposes the following revisions to Circular A-21.

1. Add Section G.12 to read as follows:

12. *Standard Format for Submission.* For facilities and administrative (F&A) proposals submitted on or after July 1, 2000, educational institutions shall use the standard format, shown in Appendix C, to submit their F&A rate proposal to the cognizant agency. The cognizant agency may, on an institution by institution basis, grant exceptions from the standard format requirement. This requirement does not apply to educational institutions which use the simplified method for calculating F&A rates, as described in Section H.

2. Add Appendix C (shown below):

Appendix C—OMB Circular A-21 Documentation Requirements for Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Proposals Claiming Costs Under the Regular Method

The documentation requirements for F&A rate proposals consist of two parts. Part I provides a schedule of summary data on the institution's F&A cost pools and their allocations, and the proposed F&A rates. An example of a completed Part I is included. Part II describes the standard documentation to be submitted with the institution's F&A proposal.

Part I—Summary Data Elements for F&A Proposal—Part A

Name of Institution: _____ Organization Number: (*Federal Use Only*)

Address: _____

a. Cognizant Federal Agency Rate Setting: _____ Audit: _____

b. Type of Institution Private () Public/State ()

c. Fiscal Year _____

d. Population Students: _____ Faculty: _____ Staff: _____

e. Status of Disclosure Statement Required to Submit (Y/N)? _____

Due Dates: Initial: _____ Revised: _____

Date Submitted _____

Approved () Yes () No Date: _____

f. Most Current F&A Rates (i.e., final, predetermined, fixed) (Last three fiscal years)

Type of rate	Fiscal year covered	Date of rate agreement	On-campus instruction	On-campus organized research	On-campus OSA*	Off-campus instruction	Off-campus organized research	Off-campus OSA*

(* OSA = Other Sponsored Activities)

g. Base year costs associated with new buildings placed into service within the last five years (i.e., base year and four preceding years) by major functions proposed (in thousands).

	Instruction	Organized research	OSA
Building Depreciation or Use Allowance			
Interest Expense			
Operation and Maintenance			

h. Dollar amounts by major functions proposed—Base Year (in thousands)

	Instruction	Organized research	OSA
Salaries & Wages/Fringes:			
—Professional/Professorial			
—Other Labor			
Non-labor Costs			
Modified Total Direct Costs			

i. Percentage of cost pool dollars allocated to major functions proposed—Base Year

	Instruction	Organized research	OSA	Other	Total
Building Depreciation or Use Allowance					
Equipment Depreciation or Use Allowance					
Interest Expense					
Operation and Maintenance					
Library					

j. Proposed methodology for library costs:

Standard Method: _____

Special Study: _____

k. Procedure for claiming fringe benefit costs:

Specific Identification: _____

Negotiated Rate: _____

Other (see attached): _____

Part I—Summary Data Elements for F&A Proposal—Part B

Name of Institution: _____
Base (or Data) Year: _____

BASE YEAR RATE CALCULATION SUMMARY BY MAJOR FUNCTION

[Dollars in thousands]

	Instruction	Organized research	OSA
FACILITIES GROUP			
Depreciation/Use Allowance:			
—Buildings	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
	_____%	_____%	_____%
—Equipment	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
	_____%	_____%	_____%
—Land Improvements	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
	_____%	_____%	_____%
Interest Expense	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
	_____%	_____%	_____%
Operation & Maintenance	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
	_____%	_____%	_____%
Library	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
	_____%	_____%	_____%

BASE YEAR RATE CALCULATION SUMMARY BY MAJOR FUNCTION—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

	Instruction	Organized research	OSA
ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP			
General	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %
Departmental	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %
Sponsored Projects	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %
Student Services	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %
Adjustment for 26% Limitation	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
MODIFIED TOTAL DIRECT COST AND F&A RATES			
On-Campus	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %
Off-Campus	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %
Other	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %
Total	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %	\$ _____ _____ %
COMPOSITION OF RATE BASE			
Federal Awards:			
On-Campus (negotiated rates)	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Off-Campus (negotiated rates)	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Research Training Awards	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other Awards (not based on negotiated rates)	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Non-Federal Sources	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Total	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
MISCELLANEOUS STATISTICS			
Cost Sharing in Rate Base	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
Assignable Square Feet (ASF) by Major Function	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
Percent of ASF Financed	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %

Part I—Example—Summary Data Elements for F&A Proposal—Part A

Name of Institution: University of XYZ

Organization Number: (Federal Use Only)

Address: 100 Main St

Somewhere, ST 12345

a. Cognizant Federal Agency Rate Setting: HHS Audit: HHS

b. Type of Institution Private () Public/State (X)

c. Fiscal Year July 1, 1997–June 30, 1998

d. Population Students: 12,000 Faculty: 1,759 Staff: 2,798

e. Status of Disclosure Statement:

Required to Submit (Y/N)? Yes

Due Dates: Initial: 06/30/98

Revised: 12/31/98

Date Submitted: 12/10/98

Approved: (X) Yes () No Date: 06/13/99

f. Most Current F&A Rates (i.e., final, predetermined, fixed) (Last three fiscal years)

Type of rate	Fiscal year covered	Date of rate agreement	On-campus instruction (percent)	On-campus organized research (percent)	On-campus OSA*	Off-campus instruction	Off-campus organized research	Off-campus OSA*
Pred	1999	09/15/96	78.0	52.5	38.3	26.0	26.0	20.0
Pred	1998	09/15/96	78.0	52.5	35.0	26.0	26.0	20.0
Pred	1997	09/15/96	76.0	53.0	35.0	26.0	26.0	20.0

(* OSA=Other Sponsored Activities)

g. Base year costs associated with new buildings placed into service within the last five years (i.e., base year and four preceding years) by major functions proposed (dollars in thousands).

	Instruction	Organized research	OSA
Building Depreciation or Use Allowance	729	2,639	0
Interest Expense	0	1,794	0
Operation and Maintenance	1,280	4,632	0

h. Dollar amounts by major functions proposed—Base Year (in thousands)

	Instruction	Organized re- search	OSA
Salaries & Wages/Fringes:			
—Professional/Professorial	27,000	57,750	6,050
—Other Labor	9,400	6,000	5,000
Non-labor Costs	19,600	21,250	1,950
Modified Total Direct Costs	56,000	85,000	13,000

i. Percentage of cost pool dollars allocated to major functions proposed—Base Year

[In percent]

	Instruction	Organized research	OSA	Other	Total
Building Depreciation or Use Allowance	40.0	44.0	2.5	13.5	100.0
Equipment Depreciation or Use Allowance	34.2	27.7	2.1	36.0	100.0
Interest Expense	29.9	32.4	1.9	35.8	100.0
Operation and Maintenance	32.8	35.6	2.1	29.5	100.0
Library	75.3	10.9	0.9	12.9	100.0

j. Proposed methodology for library costs:

Standard Method: Yes

Special Study: No

k. Procedure for claiming fringe benefit costs:

Specific Identification: No

Negotiated Rate: Yes

Other (see attached) _____

Part I—Example—Summary Data Elements for F&A Proposal—Part B

Name of Institution: University of XYZ

Base (or Data) Year: 07/01/97 to 06/30/98

BASE YEAR RATE CALCULATION SUMMARY BY MAJOR FUNCTION

[Dollars in thousands]

	Instruction		Organized research		OSA	
FACILITIES GROUP						
Depreciation/Use Allowance:						
—Buildings	4,861	9.6%	5,278	6.9%	306	2.6%
—Equipment	3,082	6.1%	2,496	3.3%	194	1.7%
—Land Improvements	1,992	4.0%	133	0.2%	17	0.1%
Interest Expense	1,944	3.9%	2,111	2.8%	122	1.0%
Operation & Maintenance	8,532	16.9%	9,264	12.1%	536	4.6%
Library	7,910	15.7%	1,146	1.5%	96	0.8%
ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP						
General	1,535	2.7%	2,330	2.7%	356	2.7%
Departmental	11,991	21.4%	17,239	20.3%	2,797	21.5%
Sponsored Projects	89	0.2%	2,693	3.2%	412	3.2%
Student Services	4,166	7.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Adjustment for 26% Limitation		−5.7%		−0.2%		−1.4%
MODIFIED TOTAL DIRECT COST AND F&A RATES						
On-Campus	50,400	82.2%	76,500	52.9%	11,700	38.3%
Off-Campus	5,600	26.0%	8,500	26.0%	1,300	26.0%
Other		00.0%		00.0%		00.0%
Total MTDC	56,000		85,000		13,000	
COMPOSITION OF RATE BASE						
Federal Awards:						
On-Campus (negotiated rates)		1,000		46,000		900
Off-Campus (negotiated rates)		120		5,000		400
Research Training Awards		0		0		0
Other Awards (not based on negotiated rates)		1,680		8,500		2,600
Non-Federal Sources		53,200		25,500		9,100

BASE YEAR RATE CALCULATION SUMMARY BY MAJOR FUNCTION—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

	Instruction	Organized research	OSA
Total	56,000	85,000	13,000
MISCELLANEOUS STATISTICS			
Cost Sharing in Rate Base	(10,000)	10,000	0
Assignable Square Feet (ASF) by Major Function	83,611	90,778	5,256
Percent of ASF Financed (1)	7.0	20.0	30.0

Note (1): Ratio of ASF subject to financing divided by total ASF. If 20% of a building's acquisition cost is financed, then 20% of the ASF is considered ASF financed.

Part II—Introduction

This Part contains the standard documentation requirements that are needed by your cognizant agency to perform a review of your institution's F&A cost proposal. This documentation supports the development of proposed rates shown in Part I and will be submitted with your F&A cost proposal.

This listing contains minimum documentation requirements.

Additional documentation may be needed by your cognizant agency before completing a proposal review.

If there are any questions about these requirements, please contact your cognizant agency.

Documentation requirements would be cross-referenced to appropriate schedule(s) within the submitted F&A cost proposal.

General Information

Reference:

- ___ 1. Copy of CPA audited certified (or State Auditor) financial statements including any affiliated organizations. The statements must be reconciled to the F&A base year cost calculation. Copy of most recently issued A-133 audit reports
- ___ 2. Copy of relevant detail supporting the financial statement, including a reconciliation schedule for each cost pool and rate base in the F&A base year cost calculation. A reconciliation schedule will show each reclassification and adjustment to the financial statements to arrive at the cost pools and rate bases in F&A base year cost calculation. Each reclassification and adjustment must be explained in notes to the reconciliation schedule
- ___ 3. Cost step-down schedule showing allocation of each F&A cost pool to the Major Functions and other cost pools
- ___ 4. Explanation for each proposed organized research rate component which exceeds 10% of the prior negotiated rate component
- ___ 5. Schedule by college or school breaking down the organized research base into amounts associated with (a) Federal awards receiving F&A cost based on the negotiated rate agreement, (b) Federal awards receiving less than the negotiated rates, (c) non-Federal awards, and (d) cost sharing
- ___ 6. Schedules clearly detailing composition and allocation base(s) of each F&A cost pool in base year cost calculation
- ___ 7. Narrative description of composition of each F&A cost pool and allocation methodology. If the institution has filed a DS-2 submission, specific references (rather than narrative descriptions) from the DS-2 may be used
- ___ 8. Narrative description of changes in accounting or cost allocation methods made since the institution's last F&A submission
- ___ 9. Copy of reports on the conduct and results of special studies
- ___ 10. Copy of the following:
 - (a) The Certificate of F&A Costs
 - (b) Lobbying Certification
 - (c) Description of procedures used to ensure that awards issued by the Federal Government do not subsidize the F&A costs allocable to awards made by non-Federal sources (e.g., industry, foreign governments)
 - (d) Statement concerning the physical inventory requirement to support claims for depreciation/use allowance charges
 - (e) Assurance Certification—for those institutions listed on Exhibit A—concerning disposition of Federal reimbursements associated with claims for depreciation/use allowances
 - (f) Assurance statement that institution is in compliance with Federal awarding agency limitations on compensation (e.g., NIH salary limitation, executive compensation)
- ___ 11. If applicable, reconciliation of carry-forward amounts from prior years used in the current proposal
- ___ 12. Transmittal letter stipulating the type(s) of rates proposed, the fiscal year(s) covered by the proposal and the base year used

Rate Proposal Summary by Major Function

- ___ 1. Summary of F&A base year rates calculated by Major Function and special rates (e.g., vessel rates) if applicable by component. These would be grouped by Administrative Components and Facilities Components. Total base year calculated rates would be disclosed, as well as allowable rates after the 26 percent limitation on Administrative Components
- ___ 2. Breakout of Modified Total Direct Cost (MTDC) rate base figures for each major function (and special rates, if applicable) by:
 - (1) On-Campus and Off-Campus amounts
 - (2) Federal awards
 - a. Based on Negotiated Rates—On-Campus
 - b. Based on Negotiated Rates—Off-Campus
 - c. Research Training Awards
 - d. Other Awards Not Based on Negotiated Rates
 - (3) Non-Federal Sources
- ___ 3. Miscellaneous Statistics including:
 - (1) Cost Sharing (including Mandatory and Voluntary amounts) in the Rate Base
 - (2) Assignable Square Feet (ASF) by Major Function
 - (3) Percentage of ASF which is financed (by Major Function)
 - (4) Breakout of Direct Salaries and Wages and fringe benefits by Professional/Professorial and Other (by Major Function)
- ___ 4. Future rate adjustments, if necessary, related to material changes since the base year. A clear description of the justification for each of the following:
 - (1) Changes by cost pool by year
 - (2) Changes in MTDC base by year

(3) Changes in F&A rates for future years

- ___ 5. Summary of future F&A rates, if necessary, by Major Function and special rates (e.g., vessel rates) which lists each administrative and facilities component by year.

Building Use Allowance and/or Depreciation

- ___ 1. Reconciliation of building cost used to compute use allowance and/or depreciation with the financial statements. If depreciation is claimed in the F&A proposal and disclosed on the financial statements, provide a reconciliation of depreciation amount with the financial statements.

Note: If an institution's financial statements do not disclose depreciation expense (those subject to GASB), a reconciliation of claimed depreciation expense to the financial statements is not possible.

- ___ 2. Schedule showing amount by building of use allowance and/or depreciation distributed to all functions
 ___ 3. If a method different from the standard square footage allocation method was used, describe method. Provide justification for its use and a schedule of allocation. If institution has filed a DS-2 submission, claimed allocation methodology may be referenced to specific section of the DS-2
 ___ 4. If depreciation is claimed, describe what useful lives by group and component have been used

Equipment Use Allowance and/or Depreciation

- ___ 1. Reconciliation of equipment cost used to compute use allowance and/or depreciation with the financial statements. If depreciation is claimed in the F&A proposal and disclosed on the financial statements, provide a reconciliation of depreciation amount with the financial statements.

Note: If an institution's financial statements do not disclose depreciation expense (those subject to GASB), a reconciliation of claimed depreciation expense to the financial statements is not possible.

- ___ 2. Schedule showing amount by building of use allowance and/or depreciation distributed to all functions
 ___ 3. If a method different from the standard square footage allocation method was used, describe the method. Provide a justification for its use and a schedule of allocation. If institution has filed a DS-2 submission, claimed allocation methodology may be referenced to specific section of the DS-2
 ___ 4. If depreciation is claimed, describe what useful lives by asset class and component have been used

Interest

- ___ 1. Reconciliation of interest cost used in the F&A base year calculation to the financial statements
 ___ 2. Schedule showing amount of interest assigned to each building and a distribution to all benefitting functions within each building for each proposed Major Function

Space Survey

- ___ 1. Summary schedule of square footage by school, department, building and function
 ___ 2. The same schedule should then be sorted by school, building, department, and function
 ___ 3. Copy of space inventory instructions, forms, and definitions

Operations and Maintenance (O&M)

- ___ 1. Summary schedule of each activity in O&M cost pool. It must show the costs by S&W/fringe benefits and all non-labor cost categories
 ___ 2. Schedule showing amount of O&M costs distributed to all functions

General Administration (G&A)

- ___ 1. Summary schedule of each activity in the G&A cost pool. It must show the costs by S&W/fringe benefits and all non-labor cost categories
 ___ 2. Schedule of costs in the modified total costs (MTC) allocation base
 ___ 3. If a method different from the standard MTC allocation method was used, describe the method. Provide a justification for its use and a schedule of allocation. If institution filed a DS-2 submission, claimed allocation methodology may be referenced to specific section of the DS-2

Departmental Administration (DA)

- ___ 1. Schedule of the DA summary by school, department and allocated to Major Functions by department
 ___ 2. Schedule identifying costs by S&W/fringe benefits and non-labor costs by department for the following functions:
 (1) Direct (Major Functions)
 a. Instruction
 b. Organized Research
 c. Other Sponsored Activities
 d. Other
 (2) Departmental Administration (excluding Deans)
 (3) Dean's office
 (4) Other, as appropriate
 S&W/fringe benefits shall be further identified as follows:
 (1) Faculty and other professional
 (2) Administrative (e.g., business officers, accountants, budget analysts, budget officers)
 (3) Technicians (e.g., lab technicians, glass washers)
 (4) Secretaries and clerical
 ___ 4. Complete description of allocation method, bases and allocation sequences (e.g., direct charge equivalent, 3.6 percent allowance). If a method different from the standard MTC allocation method was used, describe the method. Provide a justification for its use and a schedule of allocation. If institution filed a DS-2 submission, claimed allocation methodology may be referenced to specific section of the DS-2
 ___ 5. Show a detailed example (i.e., illustration of your Direct Charge Equivalent (DCE) methodology) of the allocation process used for one department which has Instruction and Organized Research functions from each of the following schools: Medicine, Arts & Sciences and Engineering, as applicable

Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA)

- ___ 1. Summary schedule for each activity included in SPA cost pool. It should show costs by S&W/fringe benefits and all non-labor cost categories
 ___ 2. Schedule of the sponsored projects direct costs in the MTC allocation base

3. If a method different from the standard sponsored projects MTC allocation method was used, describe method. Provide justification for its use and a schedule of allocation. If school filed a DS-2 submission, claimed allocation methodology may be referenced to specific section of the DS-2

Library

1. Summary schedule for each activity included in library cost pool. It would show costs by salaries and wages, books, periodicals, and all other non-labor cost categories
2. Schedule listing all credits to library costs
3. Schedule of Full Time Equivalents (FTE) and salaries and wages in the bases used to allocate library costs to users of library services
4. If the standard allocation methodology was not used, describe the alternative method and provide justification for its use. Provide schedules of allocation statistics by function. If school filed a DS-2 submission, claimed allocation methodology may be referenced to specific section of the DS-2

Student Services

1. If the proposed allocation base(s) differs from the stipulated standard allocation methodology provide:
- (a) Justification for use of a non-standard allocation methodology;
- (b) Description of allocation procedure; and
- (c) Statistical data to support proposed distribution process
- If school filed a DS-2 submission, claimed allocation methodology may be referenced to specific section of approved DS-2

[FR Doc. 99-20699 Filed 8-11-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3110-01-P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting; Notice of Public Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the Railroad Retirement Board will hold a meeting on August 18, 1999, 9 a.m., at the Board's meeting room on the 8th floor of its headquarters building, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60611. The agenda for this meeting follows:

- (1) Occupational Disability—FCE Protocols
- (2) Fiscal Year 2001 Budget
- (3) Year 2000 Issues

The entire meeting will be open to the public. The person to contact for more information is Beatrice Ezerski, Secretary to the Board, Phone No. (312) 751-4920.

Dated: August 10, 1999.

Beatrice Ezerski,

Secretary to the Board.

[FR Doc. 99-20947 Filed 8-10-99; 10:10 am]

BILLING CODE 7905-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-41706; File No. SR-NTSE-98-25]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change and Amendment Nos. 1 and 2 Thereto by the New York Stock Exchange, Inc., Relating to the Creation of a Floor Audit Trail

August 4, 1999.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

("Act"),¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on August 4, 1998, the New York Stock Exchange, Inc. ("NYSE" or Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change relating to the creation of a Floor audit trail. The Exchange submitted Amendment No. 1 to its proposal on December 21, 1998.³ On June 8, 1999, the NYSE submitted Amendment No. 2.⁴ The proposed rule change, as amended, is described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change, as amended, from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes to adopt new provisions in NYSE Rule 123, to provide for the capturing of details of an order systemically on the Floor of the Exchange. The proposed provision

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ In Amendment No. 1, the NYSE proposes to amend the discussion of the proposal contained in the purpose section of the original filing to provide additional information about the proposed floor audit trail system. See Letter from James E. Buck, Senior Vice President and Secretary, NYSE, to Richard Strasser, Assistant Director, Division of Market Regulation ("Division"), Commission, dated December 18, 1998 ("Amendment No. 1").

⁴ In Amendment No. 2, the NYSE proposes to delete from the proposal those portions of the filing relating to proposed amendments to NYSE Rule 134 (error accounts) and the adoption of new NYSE Rule 407A (member account disclosure). The NYSE also proposes, among other things, to revise the proposed rule text to include a list of data elements to be recorded in an electronic system before an order has been represented or executed on the Exchange's trading floor. See Letter from Daniel Parker Odell, Assistant Secretary, NYSE, to Richard Strasser, Assistant Director, Division, Commission, dated June 7, 1999 ("Amendment No. 2").

would require that the details of all orders be recorded in an electronic system prior to being represented or executed on the Floor. The text of the proposed rule change follows. New text is italicized.

Rule 123—Records of Orders

Paragraphs headed "Given Out", "Receipt of Orders", "Cancelled or Executed", and "By Accounts", to be numbered (a), (b), (c) and (d), respectively.

(e) System Entry Required

No Floor member may represent or execute an order on the Floor of the Exchange unless the details of the order have been first recorded in an electronic system on the Floor. Any member organization proprietary system used to record the details of the order must be capable of transmitting these details to a designated Exchange data base within such time frame as the Exchange may prescribe. The details of each order required to be recorded shall include the following data elements, any changes in the terms of the order and cancellations, in such form as the Exchange may from time to time prescribe:

1. *Symbol;*
2. *Clearing member organization;*
3. *Order identifier that uniquely identifies the order;*
4. *Identification of member or member organization recording order details;*
5. *Number of shares or quantity of security;*
6. *Side of market;*
7. *Designation as market, limit, stop, stop limit;*
8. *Any limit price and/or stop price;*
9. *Time in force;*
10. *Designation as held or not held;*
11. *Any special conditions;*
12. *System-generated time of recording order details, modification of terms of order or cancellation of order;*
13. *Such other information as the Exchange may from time to time require.*

* * * * *