(3) Further guidance on estimating deliverable supply, including consideration of whether the underlying security is readily available, is found in appendix C to part 38 of this chapter.

(b) Guidance and acceptable practices for setting limits on cash-settled equity index security futures products—(1) Guidance for setting limits on cash-settled equity index security futures products. For a security futures product, cash settled to a narrow-based security index of equity securities, a designated contract market must provide information to the designated contract market:

(i) May set the level of a position limit to that of a similar equity index option listed on a national security exchange or association; or

(ii) Should consider the deliverable supply of equity securities underlying the index, and should consider the index weighting and contract multiplier.

(2) Acceptable practices for setting limits on cash-settled equity index futures products. For a security futures product cash settled to a narrow-based security index of equity securities weighted by the number of shares outstanding, a designated contract market may set a position limit as follows:

First, determine the limit on a security futures product on each underlying equity security pursuant to § 41.25(b)(3)(i); second, multiply each such limit by the ratio of the 100-share contract size and the shares of the equity securities in the index; and third, determine the minimum level from step two and set the limit to that level, given a contract size of one U.S. dollar times the index, or for a larger contract size, reduce the level proportionately. If under these procedures each of the equity securities underlying the index is determined to be eligible for position accountability levels, the security futures product on the index itself is eligible for position accountability level.

(c) Guidance and acceptable practices for setting limits on debt security futures products—(1) Guidance for setting limits on debt security futures products. A designated contract market should set the level of a position limit greater than the equivalent of 12.5 percent of the par value of the estimated deliverable supply of the underlying debt security. For a security futures product on more than one debt security, the limit should be based on the underlying debt security with the lowest estimated deliverable supply.

(2) Acceptable practices for setting limits on debt security futures products. A designated contract market may adopt a position accountability rule for any security futures product, in addition to a position limit rule required or adopted under this section. Upon request by the designated contract market, traders who hold positions, either net or on the same side of the market, greater than such level specified pursuant to the rules of the designated contract market must provide information to the designated contract market and consent to halt increasing their positions when so ordered by the designated contract market.

(e) Guidance on exemptions from position limits. A designated contract market may approve exemptions from these position limits pursuant to rules that are consistent with § 150.5 of this chapter, or to rules that are consistent with rules of a national securities exchange or association regarding exemptions to securities option position limits or exercise limits.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 24, 2018, by the Commission.
Robert Sidman,
Deputy Secretary of the Commission.

Note: The following appendices will not appear in the Code of Federal Regulations.

Appendices to Position Limits and Position Accountability for Security Futures Products—Commission Voting Summary and Commissioner’s Statement

Appendix 1—Commission Voting Summary

On this matter, Chairman Giancarlo and Commissioners Quintenz and Behnam voted in the affirmative. No Commissioner voted in the negative.

Appendix 2—Concurring Statement of Commissioner Rostin Behnam

I respectfully concur with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission’s approval of its proposed rule regarding Position Limits and Position Accountability for Security Futures Products (the “Proposal”). I commend staff on their hard work in producing this Proposal, and for their thoughtful responses to my questions. I look forward to hearing from market participants and other stakeholders regarding the amendments to the existing position limits rules for security futures products. In particular, I will be interested in comments regarding the appropriateness of increasing the default level of equity security futures products position limits from 13,500 contracts to 25,000 contracts. While today’s Proposal only would amend the Commission’s Part 41 rules regarding security futures products, I nonetheless encourage market participants and interested stakeholders to consider how the Proposal might impact or interplay with the Commission’s position limits rules in Part 150 and any future amendments to them.
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AGENCY: Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Intent to establish negotiated rulemaking committee.

SUMMARY: We announce our intention to establish a negotiated rulemaking committee to prepare proposed regulations for the Federal Student Aid programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA) (title IV, HEA programs). We also announce our intention to create two subcommittees for this committee. In addition, we announce three public hearings at which interested parties may comment on the topics suggested by the Department and may suggest additional topics that should be considered for action by the negotiating committee. We will also accept written comments on the topics suggested by the Department and suggestions for additional topics that should be considered for action by the negotiating committee. The Department will present negotiators with proposed regulatory language at the first negotiating session.

DATES: The dates, times, and locations for the public hearings are listed under SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION. We must receive written comments on the topics suggested by the Department and additional topics that should be considered for action by the negotiating committee on or before September 14, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. We will not accept comments by fax or by email. To ensure that we do not receive duplicate copies, please submit your comments only once. In addition, please include the Docket ID at the top of your comments.

Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to www.regulations.gov to submit your comments electronically. Information on using Regulations.gov, including instructions for accessing agency documents, submitting comments, and viewing the docket, is available on the site under “Help.”

Postal Mail, Commercial Delivery, or Hand Delivery: The Department strongly encourages commenters to submit their comments electronically. However, if you mail or deliver your comments, address them to Aaron Washington, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave. SW, Room 294–12, Washington, DC 20202.

Privacy Note: The Department’s policy is to make all comments received from members of the public available for public viewing in their entirety on the Federal eRulemaking Portal at www.regulations.gov. Therefore, commenters should be careful to include in their comments only information that they wish to make publicly available.


If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll free, at 1–800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 492 of the HEA requires that, before publishing any proposed regulations to implement programs authorized under title IV of the HEA, the Secretary obtain public involvement in the development of the proposed regulations. After obtaining advice and recommendations from the public, the Secretary conducts negotiated rulemaking to develop the proposed regulations. We announce our intent to develop proposed title IV regulations by following the negotiated rulemaking procedures in section 492 of the HEA.

We intend to select participants for the negotiated rulemaking committee from nominees of organizations and groups that represent the interests significantly affected by the proposed regulations. In accordance with section 492(b)(1) of the HEA, we will select from the nominees individual negotiators who reflect the diversity among program participants.

Regulatory Issues

We intend to convene a negotiated rulemaking committee to develop proposed regulations to revise the regulations related to the Secretary’s recognition of accrediting agencies in 34 CFR part 602, and related parts as described below. The proposed topics for negotiation would include:

- Requirements for accrediting agencies in their oversight of member institutions;
- Requirements for accrediting agencies to honor institutional mission;
- Criteria used by the Secretary to recognize accrediting agencies, emphasizing criteria that focus on educational quality;
- Developing a single definition for purposes of measuring and reporting job placement rates; and
- Simplifying the Department’s process for recognition and review of accrediting agencies.

In addition to developing proposed regulations on the core functions of accreditation, the committee would also develop proposed regulations in a number of areas to promote greater access for students to high-quality, innovative programs by revising the regulations related to:

1. State authorization, to address the requirements related to programs offered through distance education or correspondence courses, including disclosures about such programs to enrolled and prospective students, and other State authorization issues (34 CFR 600.9 and 668.50);
2. The definition of “regular and substantive interaction,” as that term is used in the definitions of “correspondence course” and “distance education” in 34 CFR 600.2, 600.7, and 668.10;
3. The definition of the term “credit hour” as it is used in 34 CFR 600.2, 602.24, 603.24, and 668.8;
4. The requirement that an institution demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the length of a program and entry-level requirements for the recognized occupation for which the program prepares the student (34 CFR 668.8(e)(1)(iii) and 668.14(b)(26));
5. The arrangements between an institution and another institution or organization to provide a portion of an educational program (34 CFR 668.5);
6. The roles and responsibilities of institutions and accrediting agencies in the teach-out process (34 CFR 600.32(d) and 602.24);
7. The barriers to innovation and competition in postsecondary education or to student completion, graduation, or employment, including, but not limited to, those contained in the Department’s institutional eligibility regulations (34 CFR part 600) and student assistance general provisions (34 CFR part 668);
8. The simplification and clarification of program requirements to minimize inadvertent grant-to-loan conversions and to improve outcomes for Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant recipients (34 CFR part 866);
9. Direct assessment programs and competency-based education (34 CFR 668.10), focusing on the ability of institutions to develop, and students to progress through, innovative programs responsive to student, employer, and societal needs, including consideration of regulations that are barriers to the implementation of such programs, such as certain requirements for term-based academic calendars and satisfactory academic progress; and
10. In light of the recent United States Supreme Court decision in Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer, 137 S. Ct. 2012 (2017), and the October 6, 2017, Memorandum for All Executive Departments and Agencies issued by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to Executive Order No. 13798,1 the committee would consider revisions to the various provisions of the regulations regarding the eligibility of faith-based entities to participate in the title IV, HEA programs, including the Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs program, and the eligibility of students to obtain certain benefits under those programs (34 CFR 600.11 and parts 628, 674, 675, 676, 682, 685, 690, 692, and 694).

Finally, we intend to convene two subcommittees for this committee. One subcommittee would address proposed regulations related to direct assessment programs/competency-based education (34 CFR 668.10) focusing on the ability of institutions to develop, and students to progress through, innovative programs responsive to student, employer, and societal needs. This subcommittee could consider revisions to regulations that are barriers to the implementation of such programs, including certain requirements for term-based academic calendars and satisfactory academic progress, among other topics. The second subcommittee would make recommendations to the committee regarding revisions to the regulations regarding the eligibility of faith-based entities to participate in the title IV, HEA programs. Proposed subcommittees are formed to address specified issues and to make recommendations to the committee regarding proposed regulatory language. Subcommittees do not make decisions for the committee. While committee meetings are open to the public to attend in person, subcommittee meetings will be made available through a Department-provided livestream.

We intend to provide draft proposed regulatory language for discussion by the negotiating committee and the subcommittees prior to the first meeting of the committee or subcommittees.

After reviewing the public comments presented at the hearings and in the written submissions, we will publish a

Individuals may make only one date and time slot reserved for them. An individual would like to address, and a speaker may submit written comments at the public hearings. In addition, the Department will accept written comments via the Federal eRulemaking portal, and by postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. (See the ADDRESSES section of this document for submission information.)

Schedule for Negotiations

We anticipate that any committee established after the public hearings will begin negotiations in January of 2019, with the committee meeting for up to three sessions of three days each at roughly four- to eight-week intervals. The Department will post transcripts and audio of the sessions to www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/reg/hearulemaking/2018/index.html. We anticipate that any subcommittees established will begin meeting in January or February, after the first meeting of the committee. The committee and subcommittees will meet in the Washington, DC area. The dates and locations of these meetings will be published in a subsequent notice in the Federal Register, and will be posted on the Department’s website at www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/reg/hearulemaking/2018/index.html.


Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. You may access the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations via the Federal Digital System at: www.gpo.govfdsys. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the Federal Register, in text, or Portable Document Format (PDF). You may also access documents of the Department published in the Federal Register by using the article search feature at: www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.


Diane Auer Jones, Principal Deputy Under Secretary Delegated to Perform the Duties of Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary, Office of Postsecondary Education.
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Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Elements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve several State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of New Jersey for purposes of implementing Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for the 2008 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). The EPA is proposing to approve New Jersey's SIP revision for the control and prohibition of air pollution by volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and control and prohibition of air pollution by oxides of nitrogen (NOx), as they are intended to satisfy certain control technique guideline (CTG) and NOx RACT categories. The EPA is proposing to approve New Jersey’s certification that there are no sources within the State for the following CTGs: Manufacture of Vegetable Oils; Manufacture of Pneumatic Rubber Tires; Aerospace