monitoring needs. The product of the Review Workshop is an Assessment Summary documenting panel opinions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the stock assessment and input data. Participants for SEDAR Workshops are appointed by the Gulf of Mexico, South Atlantic, and Caribbean Fishery Management Councils and NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office, HMS Management Division, and Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Participants include data collectors and database managers; stock assessment scientists, biologists, and researchers; constituency representatives including fishermen, environmentalists, and NGO’s; International experts; and staff of Councils, Commissions, and state and federal agencies.

The items of discussion during the Assessment Webinar are as follows:

1. Using datasets and initial assessment analysis recommended from the in-person workshop, panelists will employ assessment models to evaluate stock status, estimate population benchmarks and management criteria, and project future conditions.

2. Participants will recommend the most appropriate methods and configurations for determining stock status and estimating population parameters.

Although non-emergency issues not contained in this agenda may come before this group for discussion, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during this meeting. Action will be restricted to those issues specifically identified in this notice and any issues arising after publication of this notice that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, provided the public has been notified of the intent to take final action to address the emergency.

Special Accommodations

The meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to the Council office (see ADDRESSES) at least 5 business days prior to each workshop.

Note: The times and sequence specified in this agenda are subject to change.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.


Tracey L. Thompson.
Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

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 2018 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 rule enforcement programs, specifically National Futures Association ("NFA"), a registered futures association and the designated contract markets. Fees collected from each self-regulatory organization are deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. The calculation of the fee amounts charged for 2018 by this notice is based upon an average of actual program costs incurred during fiscal year (FY) 2015, FY 2016, and FY 2017.

DATES: Each self-regulatory organization is required to remit electronically the applicable fee on or before February 11, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anthony C. Thompson, Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; (202) 418–5697; 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 associations and designated contract markets ("DCM"), each of which is a self-regulatory organization ("SRO") regulated by the Commission. The Commission recalculates the fees charged each year to cover the costs of operating this Commission program. 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

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): 211 percent for FY 2015, and 190 percent for FY 2016, and 175 percent for FY 2017.

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

---

1 National Futures Association is the only registered futures association.


3 58 FR 42643, Aug. 11, 1993, and 17 CFR part 1, appendix B.
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 + 0.5 vt = 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:

### TABLE 1—Summary of Data Used in Fee Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual total costs</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>3-Year average actual costs</th>
<th>3-Year average volume costs (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted volume costs</th>
<th>2017 Actual fee</th>
<th>2018 Assessed fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOE Futures</td>
<td>$158,209</td>
<td>$227,059</td>
<td>$31,765</td>
<td>$139,011</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>$79,398</td>
<td>$71,004</td>
<td>$79,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Board of Trade</td>
<td>17,938</td>
<td>28,720</td>
<td>98,737</td>
<td>48,465</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>231,283</td>
<td>34,058</td>
<td>48,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Mercantile Exchange</td>
<td>540,151</td>
<td>372,278</td>
<td>483,391</td>
<td>465,273</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td>537,235</td>
<td>379,377</td>
<td>465,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE Futures U.S.</td>
<td>105,864</td>
<td>286,719</td>
<td>203,826</td>
<td>232,136</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>175,696</td>
<td>431,175</td>
<td>175,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Grain Exchange</td>
<td>147,983</td>
<td>14,314</td>
<td>43,230</td>
<td>68,509</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>34,667</td>
<td>29,309</td>
<td>34,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADEX North American</td>
<td>81,758</td>
<td>217,861</td>
<td>193,118</td>
<td>14,25</td>
<td>194,451</td>
<td>172,990</td>
<td>193,118</td>
<td>193,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Mercantile Exchange</td>
<td>118,701</td>
<td>257,177</td>
<td>85,726</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>46,847</td>
<td>6,798</td>
<td>46,847</td>
<td>46,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OneChicago, LLC</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>37,311</td>
<td>18,091</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9,136</td>
<td>14,516</td>
<td>9,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASDAQ</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>37,311</td>
<td>18,091</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9,136</td>
<td>14,516</td>
<td>9,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIS Exchange</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>37,311</td>
<td>18,091</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9,136</td>
<td>14,516</td>
<td>9,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANTOR</td>
<td>102,993</td>
<td>34,331</td>
<td>1,373,924</td>
<td>1.373,924</td>
<td>1.117,763</td>
<td>1,117,763</td>
<td>1,117,763</td>
<td>1,117,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodal</td>
<td>68,509</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>34,667</td>
<td>34,667</td>
<td>8,443</td>
<td>17,333</td>
<td>34,667</td>
<td>34,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note to Table 1:** The 2018 Fee is the Lesser of the 3-year Average Actual cost or the Adjusted Volume Cost

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 = $48,465.

b. The alternative computation is: 0.5($48,465) + 0.5 (.3014) ($1,373,924) = $231,283.

c. The fee is the lesser of a or b; in this case $48,465.

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 2015 through 2017 was $453,390.

### II. Schedule of Fees

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

### TABLE 2—Schedule of Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>3-Year average actual costs</th>
<th>3-Year average volume (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted volume costs</th>
<th>2018 Assessed fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOE Futures</td>
<td>$139,011</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>$79,398</td>
<td>$79,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Board of Trade</td>
<td>48,465</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>231,283</td>
<td>48,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Mercantile Exchange</td>
<td>465,273</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td>537,235</td>
<td>465,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE Futures U.S.</td>
<td>232,136</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>175,696</td>
<td>175,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Grain Exchange</td>
<td>68,509</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>34,667</td>
<td>34,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADEX North American</td>
<td>56,146</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>29,309</td>
<td>29,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OneChicago, LLC</td>
<td>12,627</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>8,443</td>
<td>8,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASDAQ</td>
<td>85,726</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>46,847</td>
<td>46,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIS Exchange</td>
<td>20,491</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>10,246</td>
<td>10,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANTOR</td>
<td>34,331</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,166</td>
<td>17,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodal</td>
<td>1,373,924</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,117,763</td>
<td>1,117,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Futures Association</td>
<td>453,390</td>
<td></td>
<td>453,390</td>
<td>453,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,827,314</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,571,154</td>
<td>1,571,154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Payment Method


Fees collected from each self-regulatory organization shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. See 7 U.S.C 16a.

Issued in Washington, DC, on December 10, 2018, by the Commission.

Robert Sidman,
Deputy Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018–27042 Filed 12–12–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
Office of the Secretary
[Docket ID DOD–2018–HA–0098]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, DoD.

ACTION: Information collection notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Defense Health Agency announces a proposed public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by February 11, 2019.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods: Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Mail: Department of Defense, Office of the Chief Management Officer, Directorate for Oversight and Compliance, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Mailbox #24 Suite 08D09, Alexandria, VA 22350–1700.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this Federal Register document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the internet at http://www.regulations.gov as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to the Consortium for Health and Military Performance (CHAMP), Department of Military and Emergency Medicine (MEM), Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, ATTN: Mr. Ian Gutierrez, 6202B Rockledge Drive, Suite 605, Bethesda, MD 20817, at (301) 295–1362.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Associated Form; and OMB Number: Preservation of the Force and Family (POTFF) Spiritual Fitness Metrics; OMB Control Number 0720–0000.

Needs and Uses: The information collection requirement is necessary to develop and validate measures of Spiritual Fitness and Performance in line with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction on Total Force Fitness. This measure will be used by US Special Operations Command’s (USSOCOM) Preservation of the Force and Family’s (POTFF) Spiritual Performance Team to evaluate programs that enhance spiritual performance.

Affected Public: Individuals and Households.

Annual Burden Hours: 2,870.67.

Number of Respondents: 8,012.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 8,012.

Average Burden per Response: 20 minutes.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondents will be members of the general public recruited through standard internet recruiting techniques. Respondents will complete the online survey once. The responses will help in developing and validating a measure of spiritual fitness. If the information is not collected, the measure cannot be created. This will potential result in faulty evaluations of USSOCOM Chaplaincy services.


Shelly E. Finke,
Alternate OSD Federal Register, Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2018–26996 Filed 12–12–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #1

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER18–1632–003.

Applicants: Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

Description: Compliance filing: Compliance Filing—Major Maintenance Cost Component to Mitigated Offers to be effective 4/18/2019.

Filed Date: 12/7/18.

Accession Number: 20181207–5018.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/28/18.

Docket Numbers: ER18–2396–001.


Description: Compliance filing: 2018–12–07 Response to Deficiency Letter—Compliance with Order No. 844 to be effective 1/1/2019.

Filed Date: 12/7/18.

Accession Number: 20181207–5066.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/28/18.


Applicants: Wisconsin Power and Light Company.

Description: Tariff Amendment: Amendment to WPL Wholesale Formula Rate Changes to be effective 12/31/2018.

Filed Date: 12/7/18.

Accession Number: 20181207–5119.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/28/18.


Applicants: Interstate Power and Light Company.

Description: Tariff Amendment: Amendment to IPL Wholesale Formula Rate Changes to be effective 12/31/2018.

Filed Date: 12/7/18.

Accession Number: 20181207–5121.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/28/18.


Applicants: AEP Texas Inc.

Description: AEP Texas Inc. submits tariff filing per 35.13(a)[2][iii]: AEPTX–LCRA TSC Chaparrosa Facilities Development Agreement submitted on 12/3/2018 10:14:08 a.m.

Filed Date: 12/7/18.

Accession Number: 20181207–5145.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/24/18.