

Committee's notice of proposed addition included substantial additional explanation and description of the specific service requirements. Consequently, the Committee disagrees that the notice is vague and lacks specificity, and finds that the notice effectively describes the requirements the AbilityOne nonprofit agency will perform.

In accordance with Committee regulations, Federal contracting activities assist the Committee to identify necessary products and services that are suitable for procurement by the Government and may be furnished by AbilityOne nonprofit agencies. In doing so, contracting activities define their specific contract requirements and inform the Committee if there is a contractor providing the product or service. When deliberating on a proposed PL addition, the Committee then considers whether a proposed addition would likely have a severe adverse financial impact on the current contractor for the project.

Both contractors that submitted comments are awardees of the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Special Operational Equipment Tailored Logistics Support (SOE TLS) contract to provide a range of commercial products and equipment to military customers. They claim the addition of the proposed 3PL service to the Procurement List could result in severe adverse financial impact to their sales under the DLA SOE TLS contract.

In response to the comments, the Committee sought additional information from the contracting activity and the contractors, to ensure that appropriate information was fully considered. In its response, the Army contracting activity clearly stated it does not currently contract for the 3PL services as described in the statement of work (SOW). The contracting activity stated that through the SOW, it is seeking a complete one-stop standardized and centralized solution to address reduced budget and personnel capacity within PM FSS. DLA's solicitation for the SOE TLS states it is an indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contract for equipment and ancillary services. This Procurement List addition of the 3PL requirement is a firm-fixed price contract for services explicitly identified in the SOW, including direct labor services, as is appropriate for a 3PL requirement; it is not an IDIQ contract for products and equipment. Based on these facts, the Army and the Commission concluded that the DLA prime vendor contract and the Natick contract requirements for 3PL services

in this proposed PL addition are not the same. For these reasons, the contracting activity confirmed in writing and the Commission concluded that there is no current contractor providing the specific services included in the proposed PL addition.

The commercial contractors are experienced DOD vendors. One contractor's annual revenues exceed the range of revenues that the Committee determines could result in severe adverse financial impact on that contractor if the service is added to the PL. Although the Committee requested information from the contractors, they were unable to provide any contract data demonstrating they were the current contractor to the Army contracting activity (or another contracting activity) for the 3PL services required in this addition. The Committee reviews the level of impact on the "current contractor for the specific commodity or services" [41 CFR 51-2.4(a)(4)(i)]. The contractors in question are not current contractors for the specific service requirement; therefore, under Committee regulations, the Committee finds there is no severe adverse impact on the contractors. Further, the contractors continue to have the opportunity to sell products and equipment under the DLA SOE TLS prime vendor program.

One contractor also questioned whether the project would create employment for people with severe disabilities by referring to a prior project that was deleted from the PL. The Committee conducts a deliberative review of specific proposed addition projects. To qualify for addition to the PL, the Committee must determine that the record for this project demonstrates that it has the potential to generate employment for people who are blind or significantly disabled [41 CFR 51-2.4(a)(1)]. In their review, the Committee determined that the record supports that the 3PL services will create employment for people with significant disabilities. The record specifies the amount of direct labor hours to be provided by people with significant disabilities and discusses referral sources for these individuals, including current or previous nonprofit agency employees with the skills to perform the proposed new positions.

Accordingly, after full consideration, the Committee concluded that the 3PL Service is suitable for addition to the Procurement List.

Barry S. Lineback,
Director, Business Operations.

[FR Doc. 2014-24720 Filed 10-16-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353-01-P

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Fees for Reviews of the Rule Enforcement Programs of Designated Contract Markets and Registered Futures Associations

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice of 2014 Schedule of Fees.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC or Commission) charges fees to designated contract markets and registered futures associations to recover the costs incurred by the Commission in the operation of its program of oversight of self-regulatory organization (SRO) rule enforcement programs, specifically National Futures Association (NFA), a registered futures association, and the designated contract markets. The calculation of the fee amounts charged for 2014 by this notice is based upon an average of actual program costs incurred during fiscal year (FY) 2011, FY 2012, and FY 2013.

DATES: *Effective date:* Each SRO is required to remit electronically the applicable fee on or before December 16, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Jean Buhler, Chief Financial Officer, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; (202) 418-5089; Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581. For information on electronic payment, contact Jennifer Fleming; (202) 418-5034; Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background Information

A. General

This notice relates to fees for the Commission's review of the rule enforcement programs at the registered futures associations¹ and designated contract markets (DCM), each of which is an SRO regulated by the Commission. The Commission recalculates the fees charged each year to cover the costs of operating this Commission program.² The fees are set each year based on direct program costs, plus an overhead factor. The Commission calculates actual costs, then calculates an alternate fee taking volume into account, and then charges the lower of the two.³

¹ NFA is the only registered futures association.

² See section 237 of the Futures Trading Act of 1982, 7 U.S.C. 16a, and 31 U.S.C. 9701. For a broader discussion of the history of Commission fees, see 52 FR 46070 (Dec. 4, 1987).

³ 58 FR 42643 (Aug. 11, 1993) and 17 CFR part 1, app. B.

B. Overhead Rate

The fees charged by the Commission to the SROs are designed to recover program costs, including direct labor costs and overhead. The overhead rate is calculated by dividing total Commission-wide overhead direct program labor costs into the total amount of the Commission-wide overhead pool. For this purpose, direct program labor costs are the salary costs of personnel working in all Commission programs. Overhead costs generally consist of the following Commission-wide costs: Indirect personnel costs (leave and benefits), rent, communications, contract services, utilities, equipment, and supplies. This formula has resulted in the following overhead rates for the most recent three years (rounded to the nearest whole percent): 145 Percent for FY 2011, 161 percent for FY 2012, and 181 percent for FY 2013.

C. Conduct of SRO Rule Enforcement Reviews

Under the formula adopted by the Commission in 1993, the Commission

calculates the fee to recover the costs of its rule enforcement reviews and examinations, based on the three-year average of the actual cost of performing such reviews and examinations at each SRO. The cost of operation of the Commission's SRO oversight program varies from SRO to SRO, according to the size and complexity of each SRO's program. The three-year averaging computation method is intended to smooth out year-to-year variations in cost. Timing of the Commission's reviews and examinations may affect costs—a review or examination may span two fiscal years and reviews and examinations are not conducted at each SRO each year.

As noted above, adjustments to actual costs may be made to relieve the burden on an SRO with a disproportionately large share of program costs. The Commission's formula provides for a reduction in the assessed fee if an SRO has a smaller percentage of United States industry contract volume than its percentage of overall Commission oversight program costs. This adjustment reduces the costs so that, as a percentage of total Commission SRO

oversight program costs, they are in line with the pro rata percentage for that SRO of United States industry-wide contract volume.

The calculation is made as follows: The fee required to be paid to the Commission by each DCM is equal to the lesser of actual costs based on the three-year historical average of costs for that DCM or one-half of average costs incurred by the Commission for each DCM for the most recent three years, plus a pro rata share (based on average trading volume for the most recent three years) of the aggregate of average annual costs of all DCMs for the most recent three years. The formula for calculating the second factor is: $0.5a + 0.5vt =$ current fee. In this formula, "a" equals the average annual costs, "v" equals the percentage of total volume across DCMs over the last three years, and "t" equals the average annual costs for all DCMs. NFA has no contracts traded; hence, its fee is based simply on costs for the most recent three fiscal years. This table summarizes the data used in the calculations of the resulting fee for each entity:

	Actual total costs			3-year average actual costs	3-year % of volume	Volume adjusted costs	FY 2014 assessed fee
	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013				
CBOE Futures	\$98,556	\$29,278	\$235,567	\$121,134	0.66	\$65,672	\$65,672
Chicago Board of Trade	5,260	238,392	164,974	136,209	29.85	298,837	136,209
Chicago Mercantile Exchange	422,837	757,347	391,917	524,034	46.88	624,386	524,034
ELX Futures	34,593	134,267	56,287	0.212	29,782	29,782
ICE Futures U.S.	17,624	221,813	360,223	199,886	6.08	146,957	146,957
Kansas City Board of Trade	30,976	34,335	559	21,957	0.17	12,331	12,331
Minneapolis Grain Exchange	88,790	60,897	220,975	123,554	0.04	62,122	62,122
NADEX North American	11,293	101,252	37,515	0.000	18,758	18,758
New York Mercantile Exchange	136,565	7,411	135,316	93,098	15.41	165,638	93,098
NYSE LIFFE US	416,069	71,317	24,802	170,729	0.50	89,232	89,232
One Chicago	55,755	128,599	61,452	0.176	32,085	32,085
Subtotal	1,216,678	1,522,431	1,898,452	1,545,854	100	1,545,799	1,210,279
National Futures Association	416,615	487,328	186,499	363,480	363,480
Total	1,633,293	2,009,759	2,084,950	1,909,334	1,573,760

An example of how the fee is calculated for one exchange, the Chicago Board of Trade, is set forth here:

a. Actual three-year average costs equal \$136,209.

b. The alternative computation is: $(.5) (\$136,209) + (.5) (.298) (\$1,545,854) = \$298,837$.

c. The fee is the lesser of a or b; in this case \$136,209.

As noted above, the alternative calculation based on contracts traded is not applicable to NFA because it is not a DCM and has no contracts traded. The Commission's average annual cost for conducting oversight review of the NFA rule enforcement program during fiscal years 2011 through 2013 was \$363,480

(one-third of \$1,090,441). The fee to be paid by the NFA for the current fiscal year is \$363,480.

II. Schedule of Fees

Fees for the Commission's review of the rule enforcement programs at the registered futures associations and DCMs regulated by the Commission are as follows:

	3-year average actual cost	2014 fee lesser of actual or calculated fee
CBOE Futures	\$ 121,134	\$ 65,672
Chicago Board of Trade	136,209	136,209
Chicago Mercantile Exchange	524,034	524,034
ELX Futures	56,287	29,782
ICE Futures U.S.	199,886	146,957
Kansas City Board of Trade	21,957	12,331
Minneapolis Grain Exchange	123,554	62,122
NADEX North American	37,515	18,758
New York Mercantile Exchange	93,098	93,098
NYSE LIFFE US	170,729	89,232
One Chicago	61,452	32,085
Subtotal	1,545,854	1,210,279
National Futures Association	363,480	363,480
Total	1,909,334	1,573,760

III. Payment Method

The Debt Collection Improvement Act (DCIA) requires deposits of fees owed to the government by electronic transfer of funds. See 31 U.S.C. 3720. For information about electronic payments, please contact Jennifer Fleming at (202) 418-5034 or jfleming@cftc.gov, or see the CFTC Web site at www.cftc.gov, specifically, www.cftc.gov/cftc/cftcelectronicpayments.htm.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 16a.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 10, 2014, by the Commission.

Christopher J. Kirkpatrick,
Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014-24624 Filed 10-16-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

[Docket No: CFPB-2014-0027]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

AGENCY: Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (Bureau) is proposing a new information collection titled, "Bridges to Financial Security: A Multi-site Demonstration Project."

DATES: Written comments are encouraged and must be received on or before December 16, 2014 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by the title of the information collection, OMB Control Number (see

below), and docket number (see above), by any of the following methods:

- **Electronic:** <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- **Mail:** Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (Attention: PRA Office), 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552.
- **Hand Delivery/Courier:** Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (Attention: PRA Office), 1275 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20002.

Please note that comments submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. In general, all comments received will become public records, including any personal information provided. Sensitive personal information, such as account numbers or social security numbers, should not be included.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Documentation prepared in support of this information collection request is available at www.regulations.gov. Requests for additional information should be directed to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, (Attention: PRA Office), 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552, (202) 435-9575, or email: PRA@cfpb.gov. Please do not submit comments to this mailbox.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Title of Collection: Bridges to Financial Security: A Multi-site Demonstration Project.

OMB Control Number: 3170-XXXX.

Type of Review: New collection (Request for a new OMB control number).

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 15,000.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 42,386.

Abstract: The Bureau, beginning in the winter of 2015, will launch a multi-site financial education demonstration project to provide one-on-one and group financial counseling/coaching services to individuals with disabilities transitioning into the workplace or already employed. The goal is twofold: (1) To improve the financial skills of approximately 15,000 individuals across the spectrum of disability to effectively navigate the financial marketplace, resulting in improved credit, reduced debt, and increased savings; and (2) to build the capacity of diverse multi-sector systems (non-disability and disability) in up to 14 cities to unite around the common purpose of building financial security for individuals with disabilities. Monthly qualitative reports and quantitative aggregated individual data will be collected from participating sites to document the design, growth and impact of up to 14 integrated diverse delivery models serving primarily low-income populations with disabilities.

Request for Comments: Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) The accuracy of the Bureau's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methods and the assumptions used; (c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the