the Contributor to immediately obtain a full refund of the Contribution. Applicant submits that the Adviser reviewed its Policy and concluded that it was adequate for preventing impermissible contributions.

10. Applicant states that after learning of the Contribution, the Adviser, out of an abundance of caution, instructed him not to solicit or otherwise communicate with the Clients for two years following the date of the Contribution.

11. Applicant asserts that the Clients’ decisions to invest with the Adviser occurred long before the Contribution was made. Furthermore, no investments were made in the month-long period between the date of the Contribution and the day it was refunded. Applicant states that, at the time of the Contribution and at the time of the investments by the Clients, the Official has not had any role in the Clients’ investment decisions. Applicant also submits that the apparent intent in making the Contribution was not to influence the selection or retention of the Adviser. Applicant represents that the Contributor and the Official have a long standing friendship as the Contributor worked at the Official’s restaurant and lived with the Official and her ex-husband when he was in college. Applicant finally states that it was because of that relationship, and not any desire to influence the award of investment advisory business that the Contributor made the Contribution to the Official’s campaign.

12. Applicant submits that neither the Adviser nor the Contributor sought to interfere with the Clients’ merit-based selection process for advisory services, nor did they seek to negotiate higher fees or greater ancillary benefits than would be achieved in arms’ length transactions. Applicant further submits that there was no violation of the Adviser’s fiduciary duty to deal fairly or disclose material conflicts given the absence of any intent or action by the Adviser or the Contributor to influence the selection process. Applicant contends that in the case of the Contribution, the imposition of the two-year prohibition on compensation does not achieve rule 206(4)–5’s purposes and would result in consequences disproportionate to the mistake that was made.

Applicant’s Conditions

The Applicant agrees that any order of the Commission granting the requested relief will be subject to the following conditions:

1. The Contributor will be prohibited from discussing the business of the Adviser with any “government entity” client for which the Official is an “official,” each as defined in Rule 206(4)–5(f), until October 18, 2018.

2. The Contributor will receive a written notification of this condition and will provide a quarterly certificate of compliance until October 18, 2018. Copies of the certifications will be maintained and preserved in an easily accessible place for a period of not less than five years, the first two years in an appropriate office of the Adviser, and be available for inspection by the staff of the Commission.

3. The Adviser will conduct testing reasonably designed to prevent violations of the conditions of the Order and maintain records regarding such testing, which will be maintained and preserved in an easily accessible place for a period of not less than five years, the first two years in an appropriate office of the Adviser, and be available for inspection by the staff of the Commission.

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

Eduardo A. Aleman, Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2017–22955 Filed 10–23–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SELElVITIC SERVICE SYSTEM
Forms Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for Extension of Clearance

AGENCY: Selective Service System.

ACTION: Notice.

The following forms have been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for extension of clearance in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act:

SSS Forms 2, 3A, 3B and 3C

Title: Selective Service System Change of Information, Correction/Change Form, and Registration Status Forms.

Purpose: To insure the accuracy and completeness of the Selective Service System registration data.

Respondents: Registrants are required to report changes or corrections in data submitted on the SSS Form 1.

Frequency: When changes in a registrant’s name or address occur.

Burden: A burden of two minutes or less on the individual respondent.

Copies of the above identified forms can be obtained upon written request to the Selective Service System, Reports Clearance Officer, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22209– 2425.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed extension of clearance of the form should be sent within 60 days of the publication of this notice to the Selective Service System, Reports Clearance Officer, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22209–2425.

A copy of the comments should be sent to the Office of Information and
Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Desk Officer, Selective Service System, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 3235, Washington, DC 20503.

Donald M. Benton, Director.

[FR Doc. 2017–23010 Filed 10–23–17; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 8015–01–P

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
[Docket No. SSA–2017–0058]

Notice of Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board Membership

AGENCY: Social Security Administration.

ACTION: Notice of Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board Membership.

Title 5, U.S. Code, 4314(c)(4), requires that the appointment of Performance Review Board members be published in the Federal Register before service on said Board begins.

The following persons will serve on the Performance Review Board which oversees the evaluation of performance appraisals of Senior Executive Service members of the Social Security Administration:

Michael Kramer
Bonnie Doyle *
Joanne Gasparini
Erik Hansen *
John Lee
Joseph Lytle *
Natalie Lu
Dan Parry *
Patrice Stewart *

* New Member

MARIANNA LACANFORA,
Deputy Commissioner for Human Resources.


DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Highway Administration
[Docket No. FHWA–2017–0044]

Proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Assigning Certain Federal Environmental Responsibilities to the State of Arizona, Including National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Authority for Certain Categorical Exclusions (CEs)

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed MOU; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FHWA and the State of Arizona, acting by and through its Department of Transportation (State), propose participation of the State in the Categorical Exclusion Assignment program. This Program allows FHWA to assign to States its authority and responsibility for determining whether certain designated activities within the geographic boundaries of the State, as specified in the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), are categorically excluded from preparation of an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 24, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by DOT Document Management System (DMS) Docket Number [FHWA–2017–0044], by any of the methods described below. To ensure that you do not duplicate your