

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22th day of September 1995.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ledyard B. Marsh,

*Director, Project Directorate I-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-24224 Filed 9-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER

### Procedures for Publication of Federal Register Documents During a Funding Hiatus

**AGENCY:** Office of the Federal Register.

**ACTION:** Notice of special procedures.

**SUMMARY:** Due to the possibility of a lapse in appropriations and in accordance with the provisions of the Antideficiency Act, as amended by Public Law No. 101-508, 104 Stat. 1388 (31 U.S.C. 1341), the Office of the Federal Register (OFR) announces special procedures for agencies submitting documents to be published in the Federal Register.

In the event of an appropriations lapse, the OFR would be required to publish documents directly related to the performance of governmental functions necessary to address imminent threats to the safety of human life or protection of property. Since it would be impracticable for the OFR to make case-by-case determinations as to whether certain documents are directly related to activities that qualify for an exemption under the Antideficiency Act, the OFR will place responsibility on agencies submitting documents to certify that their documents relate to emergency activities authorized under the Act.

During a funding hiatus affecting one or more Federal agencies, the OFR will remain open to accept and process documents authorized to be published in the daily Federal Register in the absence of continuing appropriations. An agency wishing to submit a document to the OFR during a funding hiatus must attach a transmittal letter to the document which states that publication in the Federal Register is necessary to safeguard human life, protect property, or provide other emergency services consistent with the performance of functions and services exempted under the Antideficiency Act.

Under the August 16, 1995 opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice, exempt functions and services would include activities such as those related to the constitutional duties of the President,

food and drug inspection, air traffic control, responses to natural or manmade disasters, law enforcement and supervision of financial markets. Documents related to normal or routine activities of Federal agencies, even if funded under prior year appropriations, will not be published.

At the onset of a funding hiatus, the OFR may suspend the regular three-day publication schedule to permit a limited number of exempt personnel to process emergency documents. Agency officials will be informed as to the schedule for filing and publishing individual documents.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Richard Claypoole or Michael White, (202) 523-4534.

#### Authority

The authority for this action is 44 U.S.C. 1502 and 1 CFR 2.4 and 5.1.

Dated: September 28, 1995.

Richard L. Claypoole,

*Director of the Federal Register.*

[FR Doc. 95-24535 Filed 9-28-95; 11:09 am]

BILLING CODE 1505-02-M

## OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

### Guidelines and Instructions for Implementing Section 204, "State, Local, and Tribal Government Input," of Title II of Public Law 104-4

**AGENCY:** Office of Management and Budget.

**ACTION:** Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies.

**SUMMARY:** On March 22, 1995, the President signed into law the "Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995" (P.L. 104-4). This notice provides guidance to agencies on the Act.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeff Hill, 395-7340.

Attached to this notice is the material for inclusion in the Federal Register.

Dated: September 25, 1995.

John B. Arthur,

*Assistant Director for Administration.*

Memorandum for the Heads of Departments and Agencies

*FROM:* Alice M. Rivlin, Director.

*SUBJECT:* Guidelines and Instructions and Implementing Section 204, "State, Local, and Tribal Government Input," of Title II of P.L. 104-4.

On March 22, 1995, President Clinton signed into law the "Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995" (P.L. 104-4) (the "Act"). Section 204(a) of the Act requires that—

"Each agency shall, to the extent permitted in law, develop an effective process to permit elected officers of State, local, and tribal governments (or their designated employees with authority to act on their behalf) to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory proposals containing significant Federal intergovernmental mandates."<sup>1</sup>

Section 204(b) of the Act provides an exemption from the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) for intergovernmental consultations involving intergovernmental responsibilities or administration.

Section 204(c) requires the President to issue guidelines and instructions to Federal agencies "for appropriate implementation" of both of these provisions "consistent with applicable laws and regulations." In accordance with the President's delegation of authority,<sup>2</sup> OMB is today issuing those guidelines and instructions.<sup>3</sup>

#### I. The Process for Intergovernmental Consultation

It is important that this intergovernmental consultation process not only achieves meaningful input, but also builds a better understanding among Federal, State, local, and tribal governments. As described in Part II, below, the process required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act is not to act as a hindrance to full and effective intergovernmental consultation.

##### A. What Agencies Are Covered?

The process for intergovernmental consultation called for by Section 204(a) applies to all Federal agencies (as

<sup>1</sup> The Act's consultation requirement builds on that set forth by President Clinton on October 26, 1993, in Executive Order No. 12875. In order "reduce the imposition of unfunded mandates upon State, local, and tribal governments," the Executive order requires agencies, when they seek to impose unfunded mandates upon State, local, or tribal governments through a regulation, to provide to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget "a description of the extent of the agency's prior consultation with representatives of affected State, local, and tribal governments, the nature of their concerns, any written communications submitted to the agency by such units of government, and the agency's position supporting the need to issue the regulation containing the mandate" (Sec. 1(a)(2)).

<sup>2</sup> See 60 Fed. Reg. 45039 (August 29, 1995).

<sup>3</sup> Portions of these guidelines and instructions are based on OMB Memorandum M-94-10, entitled "Guidance for Implementing E.O. 12875, 'Reduction of Unfunded Mandates,'" issued by Director Leon E. Panetta on January 11, 1994. These guidelines and instructions are not intended, and should not be construed, to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or its employees. Neither are these guidelines and instructions intended, nor should they be construed, to limit the availability of any exclusion from the Federal Advisory Committee Act contained in that Act or any applicable regulations.

defined in 5 U.S.C. 551(1)), with the exception of independent regulatory agencies.

#### *B. When Should Intergovernmental Consultations Take Place?*

Intergovernmental consultation should take place as early in the regulatory process as possible. Except where the need for immediate agency action precludes prior consultation, consultation should occur before publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking or other regulatory action proposing a significant Federal intergovernmental mandate.

Consultation should continue after publication of the regulatory action initiating the proposal. Except in exceptional circumstances where the need for immediate action precludes prior consultation, consultation must occur prior to the formal promulgation in final form of the regulatory action.

#### *C. With Whom Should Agencies Consult?*

The statute directs agencies to develop an effective process to ensure that "elected officers of State, local, and tribal governments (or their designated employees with authority to act on their behalf)" who wish to provide meaningful and timely input are able to do so.

Each agency needs to develop an intergovernmental consultation process for that agency. To do so, the agency should first develop a proposal for that process, and consult with State, local, and tribal governments (as appropriate) concerning this proposed process, as soon as possible.

One approach an agency may wish to adopt is to designate a person or an office through which intergovernmental consultation should be coordinated. Another approach is for an agency to instruct those responsible for developing a rule to seek out the views of elected officers of their designated employees. An agency may also wish to develop other effective means of generating meaningful input or expand those that it already has. An agency will be able to obtain the fullest range of meaningful input from State local, and tribal governments by undertaking the following kinds of consultation.

##### (1) Heads of Government

Agencies should seek to consult with the highest levels of the pertinent government units, e.g., the Office of the Governor, Mayor, or Tribal Leader (or their designated employees with authority to act on their behalf). These officials are the ones elected to represent the people and are the ones

that the public holds directly accountable for the actions of those government units.

##### (2) Both Program and Financial Officials

Many regulatory agencies have functional counterparts in State, local, and tribal governments, e.g., those government officials who implement or enforce regulatory responsibilities required in whole or part by the Federal agency. These local officials tend to be those most familiar with the Federal agency's regulatory program, and should be consulted as a source of important information concerning the likely effects of, or effective alternatives to, Federal regulatory proposals.

In addition, agencies should consult with those State, local, and tribal officials most directly responsible for ensuring the funding of compliance with the Federal mandate, e.g., the applicable treasury, budget, tax-collection, or other financial officials. These officials are institutionally responsible for balancing the competing claims for scarce State, local, or tribal resources.

##### (3) Washington Representatives

It is also important that Federal agencies consult with Washington representatives, where available, of associations representing elected officials. These Washington representatives often know which local elected officials are the most knowledgeable about, interested in, or responsible for, implementing specific issues, regulations or programs, and can ensure that a broad range of government officials learn of and provide valuable insight concerning a proposed intergovernmental mandate.

##### (4) Small Governments

Agencies should make special efforts to consult with officials of small governments, and to develop a plan for such consultation under section 203 of Title II of the Act. Agencies may wish to consider several mechanisms for reaching small governments, including special task forces, periodic mailings through small government associations, or communication through rural development councils.

#### *D. How Much Consultation Should There Be?*

The scope of intergovernmental consultation should be based on common sense and be commensurate with the significance of the action being taken. The more costly, the more potentially disruptive, the more broadly applicable, the more controversial the proposed Federal intergovernmental

mandate—the more consultation there should be. An agency should decide the extent of its consultation on a case-by-case basis; a one-size-fits-all prescription is neither appropriate nor desirable.

#### *E. What Should Be the Content of Consultation?*

Agencies should seek views of State, local, and tribal governments regarding costs, benefits, risks, and alternative and flexible methods of compliance regarding their regulatory proposals. Agencies should also seek views on potential duplication with existing laws or regulations at other levels of government, and on ways to harmonize their rules with State, local and tribal policies and programs.

To assist with these consultations, agencies should first estimate the direct costs to be incurred by the State, local, or tribal governments in complying with the mandate and then inform the affected governmental units of these cost estimates. Estimates should cover both up-front and recurring costs, for a reasonable number of years after the rule is to be put into effect. To the extent practicable, agencies should make reasonable efforts to disaggregate these cost estimates as they affect the various levels of government, or otherwise provide the criteria by which those affected can disaggregate the cost estimates in order to determine the potential costs to themselves. Where quantitative estimates are not feasible, agencies should work with other levels of government to discern and discuss qualitative costs.

Agencies should also consult on and estimate the benefits expected from the mandate for States, localities, tribes, and their residents and businesses. Estimates should cover both up-front and recurring benefits for a reasonable number of years after the rule is to be put into effect. To the extent practicable, agencies should make reasonable efforts to disaggregate these benefit estimates as they affect the various levels of government, or otherwise provide the criteria by which those affected can disaggregate the benefit estimates in order to determine the potential benefits to themselves. Where quantitative estimates are not feasible, agencies should work with other levels of government to discern and discuss qualitative benefits.

Agencies should also, during the consultative process, seek views on the expected method of compliance. Governmental units may have suggestions as to how to achieve the Federal regulatory objective in a way that is more effective, efficient flexible,

and consistent with State, local, and tribal governmental regulatory and other functions.

*F. How Should Agencies Integrate These Intergovernmental Consultations into the Rulemaking Process?*

It is important for agencies to integrate these consultation activities into the ongoing rulemaking process. The cost and benefit estimates, any additional viable suggestions received during the pre-notice consultations, and the agency plan to carry out intergovernmental consultation should be included in the preamble to the notice of proposed rulemaking. Publication of consultation plan in the Federal Register will assure that those governmental units that are not contacted directly will have access to the same cost and benefit estimates as those who were contacted directly, and have the opportunity to make their concerns known. Similarly, and consistent with E.O. 12875, any preamble transmitted to the Federal Register on or after October 2, 1995, should include, as of the particular stage of the rulemaking, the extent of the agency's prior consultations with representatives of affected State, local, and tribal governments, the nature of their concerns, any written communications submitted to the agency by such units of government, and the agency's position supporting the need to issue the regulation containing the mandate.

*G. What Compliance Reports Should Agencies Submit to OMB?*

Under Section 208 of the Act, OMB is required to submit a report to Congress on agency compliance with the requirements of Title II of the Act, which includes the intergovernmental consultation requirement, on or before March 22, 1996, and annually thereafter. Accordingly, agencies should provide the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, by January 15, 1996, and annually on that date thereafter, a written report of each agency's compliance with Title II of the Act. The report should include a description of the process established by the agency to ensure meaningful input, as well as a description of agency consultations with State, local, and tribal governments for each proposed and final rule "containing significant Federal intergovernmental mandates." As part of the report to be submitted by January 15, 1996, agencies should also describe the plans they have developed to consult with small governments, under Section 203 of Title II of the Act.

**II. The Exemption From the Federal Advisory Committee Act**

In order to facilitate the consultation process, section 204(b) of the Act provides an exemption from the Federal Advisory Committee Act ("FACA") (5 U.S.C. App.) "for the exchange of official views regarding the implementation of public laws requiring shared intergovernmental responsibilities or administration."<sup>4</sup> This exemption applies to all Federal agencies subject to FACA, and is not limited to the intergovernmental consultations required by Section 204(a) but instead applies to the entire range of intergovernmental responsibilities or administration. In accordance with the legislative intent, the exemption should be read broadly to facilitate intergovernmental communications on responsibilities or administration.

This exemption applies to meetings between Federal officials and employees and State, local, or tribal governments, acting through their elected officers, officials, employees, and Washington representatives, at which "views, information, or advice" are exchanged concerning the implementation of intergovernmental responsibilities or administration, including those that arise explicitly or implicitly under statute, regulation, or Executive order.<sup>5</sup>

The scope of meetings covered by the exemption should be construed broadly to include any meetings called for any purpose relating to intergovernmental responsibilities or administration. Such meetings include, but are not limited to, meetings called for the purpose of seeking consensus; exchanging views, information, advice, and/or recommendations; or facilitating any other interaction relating to intergovernmental responsibilities or administration.

The guidance given above should help determine when a meeting qualifies under Section 204(b) of the Act for an exemption from the FACA. We also note that meetings that do not meet these guidelines for an exemption may nonetheless not be subject to the FACA in the first instance. Accordingly, to

<sup>4</sup> House Conference Report 104-76 (March 13, 1995), p. 40.

<sup>5</sup> Specifically, this exemption from FACA applies where—

"(1) meetings are held exclusively between Federal officials and elected officers of State, local, and tribal governments (or their designated employees with authority to act on their behalf), acting in their official capacities; and

"(2) such meetings are solely for the purposes of exchanging information, or advice relating to the management or implementation of Federal programs established pursuant to public law that explicitly or inherently share intergovernmental responsibilities or administration."

determine whether there is even a need for an exemption from the FACA, agencies should also consult the FACA itself, as well as the General Service Administration's regulations at 41 CFR Subpart 101-6.10, and the court decisions construing the FACA.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is important that agencies make their best efforts to implement these guidelines and instructions. As the Conference Report stated, "an important part of efforts to improve the Federal regulatory process entails improved communications with State, local, and tribal governments. Accordingly, this legislation will require Federal agencies to establish effective mechanisms for soliciting and integrating the input of such interests into the Federal decision-making process."<sup>6</sup>

If agencies have any questions concerning these guidelines and instructions, they should contact the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, or her staff. OMB will provide additional guidance as experience and need dictate.

---

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

[Release No. 34-36272; File No. SR-OCC-95-01]

**Self-Regulatory Organizations; the Options Clearing Corporation; Notice of Withdrawal of a Proposed Rule Change**

September 22, 1995.

On January 23, 1995, The Options Clearing Corporation ("OCC") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),<sup>1</sup> a proposed rule change clarifying OCC's Rules regarding the unavailability of current index values. Notice of the proposed rule was published in the Federal Register on March 17, 1995.<sup>2</sup> On September 19, 1995, OCC filed a request that the proposed rule change be withdrawn.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>6</sup> House Conference Report 104-76 (March 13, 1995), p. 40.

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) (1988).

<sup>2</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 35472 (March 10, 1995), 60 FR 14475 [File No. SR-OCC-95-01].

<sup>3</sup> Letter from James C. Yong, First Vice President and General Counsel, OCC, to Jerry Carpenter, Assistant Director, Division of Market Regulation, Commission, (September 15, 1995).

For the Commission by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>4</sup>

Margaret H. McFarland,  
*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-24261 Filed 9-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

[Release No. 35-26378]

**Filings Under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended ("Act")**

September 22, 1995.

Notice is hereby given that the following filing(s) has/have been made with the Commission pursuant to provisions of the Act and rules promulgated thereunder. All interested persons are referred to the application(s) and/or declaration(s) for complete statements of the proposed transaction(s) summarized below. The application(s) and/or declaration(s) and any amendments thereto is/are available for public inspection through the Commission's Office of Public Reference.

Interested persons wishing to comment or request a hearing on the application(s) and/or declaration(s) should submit their views in writing by October 16, 1995, to the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC 20549, and serve a copy on the relevant applicant(s) and/or declarant(s) at the address(es) specified below. Proof of service (by affidavit or, in case of an attorney at law, by certificate) should be filed with the request. Any request for hearing shall identify specifically the issues of fact or law that are disputed. A person who so requests will be notified of any hearing, if ordered, and will receive a copy of any notice or order issued in the matter. After said date, the application(s) and/or declaration(s), as filed or as amended, may be granted and/or permitted to become effective.

General Public Utilities Corporation  
(70-7670)

General Public Utilities Corporation ("GPU"), 100 Interpace Parkway, Parsippany, New Jersey 07054, a registered holding company, has filed a post-effective amendment to its application-declaration under sections 6(a) and 7 of the Act and rules 53 and 54 thereunder.

By order of the Commission dated October 23, 1989 (HCAR No. 24971) ("1989 Order"), GPU was authorized to issue and sell, from time to time through December 31, 1995, pursuant to a

Dividend Reinvestment and Stock Purchase Plan ("Plan"), up to 2.5 million shares of its common stock, \$2.50 par value ("Common Stock"). Common Stock is purchased under the Plan either on the open market or directly from GPU from authorized but unissued shares or previously reacquired shares, as GPU may direct, by the administrator of the Plan.

GPU now proposes to extend to December 31, 2000 the time it may issue and sell authorized but unissued and reacquired shares of Common Stock under the Plan.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, pursuant to delegated authority.

Margaret M. McFarland,  
*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-24184 Filed 9-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

[Rel. No. IC-21371; 812-9266]

**T. Rowe Price Spectrum Fund, Inc., et al.; Notice of Application**

September 22, 1995.

**AGENCY:** Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC").

**ACTION:** Notice of application for exemption under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act").

**APPLICANTS:** T. Rowe Price Growth Stock Fund, Inc., T. Rowe Price New Horizons Fund, Inc., T. Rowe Price New Era Fund, Inc., T. Rowe Price New Income Fund, Inc., T. Rowe Price Prime Reserve Fund, Inc., T. Rowe Price Growth & Income Fund, Inc., T. Rowe Price Short-Term Bond Fund, Inc., T. Rowe Price High Yield Fund, Inc., T. Rowe Price Equity Income Fund, T. Rowe Price GNMA Fund, T. Rowe Price International Funds, Inc., and each open-end management investment company (1) that in the future becomes advised by T. Rowe Price Associates, Inc. ("T. Rowe Price") and/or Row Price-Fleming International, Inc. ("Price-Fleming") and distributed by T. Rowe Price Investment Services, Inc. ("Investment Services"), and (2) that holds itself out to investors as a related fund for purposes of investment and investor services (collectively, the "Price Funds"); T. Rowe Price Spectrum Fund, Inc. (the "Spectrum Fund"); T. Rowe Price Associates, Inc. ("T. Rowe Price"); Rowe Price-Fleming International, Inc. ("Price-Fleming"); T. Rowe Price Investment Services, Inc. ("Investment Services"); and T. Rowe Price Services, Inc. ("Price Services").

**RELEVANT ACT SECTIONS:** Order requested under section 6(c) to exempt the

applicants from sections 12(d)(1) (A) and (B), sections 6(c) and 17(b) to exempt applicants from section 17(a), and rule 17d-1 under the Act to permit certain joint transactions otherwise prohibited by section 17(d) and rule 17d-1.

**SUMMARY OF APPLICATION:** The requested order would supersede two prior orders that permit the T. Rowe Price Spectrum Fund, Inc. ("the "Spectrum Fund") to operate as a "fund of funds." The existing relief imposes a number of restrictions that limit the manner in which the Spectrum Fund may operate. The requested order would permit the Spectrum Fund to continue operating as a fund of funds while eliminating many of the restrictions from the prior order.

**FILING DATES:** The application was filed on September 29, 1994, and amended on April 28, 1995, August 16, 1995, and August 23, 1995.

**HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING:** An order granting the application will be issued unless the SEC orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary and serving applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the SEC by 5:30 p.m. on October 17, 1995, and should be accompanied by proof of service on applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary.

**ADDRESSES:** Secretary, SEC, 450 5th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20549. Applicants, 100 East Pratt Street, Baltimore, MD 21202.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Elaine M. Boggs, Staff Attorney, at (202) 942-0572, or C. David Messman, Branch Chief, at (202) 942-0564 (Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Company Regulation).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained for a fee at the SEC's Public Reference Branch.

**Applicant's Representation**

1. The Spectrum Fund is a registered, no-load, open-end, management investment company organized as a Maryland corporation. The Spectrum Fund began offering its shares to the public in 1990 and consists of two series: the Growth Fund and the Income Fund (the "Portfolios"), with assets as of June 30, 1995 of approximately \$1.1

<sup>4</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12) (1994).