(4) Schedule vs. priority
(5) Measure percentage of closed activities as a multiple of how fast they were requested to be closed out.
(6) Internal review to ensure quality; develop a standard. SERs should be reviewed by independent group.
(7) At licensing workshops, get attributes for quality submittals and SERs.
7. Five activities least important.
(1) Use of PMs as acting resident.
(2) Collateral duties (e.g., lead PM assignments).
(3) Requirement to submit routine reports that don't appear to receive NRC review.
(4) Should review 10 CFR 50.54 changes on audit basis instead of reviewing and approving each change.
(5) PMs should not be responsible for ensuring accuracy of licensing basis. That's the licensee's responsibility.
8. Reasons these activities are less important (7).
(1) Not efficient or effective use of PM.
(2) Not efficient or effective use of PM, could harm safety by distracting PM from primary responsibility.
(3) Regulatory burden with no benefit.
(4) Regulatory burden with no benefit.
(5) Not efficient or effective use of PM.
9. Any activities projects organization should not perform?
(1) DLPM should not be doing technical specifications bases reviews in some cases (Distinguish between improved technical specifications (ITS) and non-ITS plants for TS bases changes (bases control program)).
10. Additional input/Other Issues.
(1) ''Cherry picking''—NRC should issue Generic Letter identifying what new improved technical specifications items they can get.
(2) Administrative support
—OGC—work of OGC should be better controlled to improve process
—Concurrence chain ''empowerment''—concurrences should be minimized
—There should be enough administrative support to prevent typing/distribution causing delays in the licensing process.
(3) Clarify role of PM/NRR in new oversight process
—ensure consistency
—role in 50.59 inspection
—SDP—NRR may need to support regional Senior Risk Analysts/others
—Plant performance reviews
(4) NRR should have input to new process (PMs)
(5) Need more informal ways of taking advantage of generic resolutions
(6) Need to define role of PM in license renewal and decommissioning. Need to retain same PM.
(7) Need the Infrastructure to support PM.
(8) For informal surveys, need to ensure consistency; timeliness; NRC expectations;
(9) TIA process should be more open to allow licensee input.

Region IV

There was a fair bit of discussion about the need to distinguish between what PMs should do, and what DLPM/NRR should do when the group considered the following questions. In some cases, the group has delineated their responses accordingly.
1. Principal role of projects.
(1) Coordination.
(2) Interface with NRR/Licensee.
—advocate for licensee
—(or) representative of licensee
—on schedule
(3) Screening Requests for additional information (RAIs) and staff decisions for regulatory basis/achieve burden reduction.
Advance reactor safety by providing a knowledgeable interface between NRC and licensees and ensuring licensing actions are processed efficiently.
2. Five activities most important.
The following items are important for PMs:
(1) Licensing action coordination (true project management role).
(1a) licensing action review/approval performed by PM (personal approval).
(2) Communication with licensees—explain what is needed/required by the staff, and why it is needed (regulatory basis).
(3) Screening RAIs, and guarding the licensing basis.
(4) Keep senior NRC management informed of activities at that plant.
The following items are important for DLPM:
(5) Coordination/prioritization with other divisions.
(6) NRR/region interface.
(7) Regulatory improvements.
3. Reasons these activities are important (2).
(1) PM should evaluate licensing actions, RAIs, work priorities, etc. against outcome goals and reject those that don't conform with outcome goals.
4. Other activities projects should perform.
(1) Relationship with media, and maintain sensitivity when providing information that has financial or commercial consequences.
(2) Participate in site inspections.
(3) Be more involved with enforcement.
(4) Be more involved with new performance assessment process.
5. Reasons these activities are important (4).
(1) Relationship to outcome goals.
6. What types of performance indicators would be useful?
(1) Number of days deviation from project schedule (joint agreement between staff and licensee on schedule).
(2) Current goals, e.g., 95% < 1 year, *not* appropriate for all licensing actions.
(3) Number of RAIs.
(4) Quality of licensing action, e.g., number of errors.
(5) Percentage of licensing actions performed by project manager.
7. Five activities least important.
(1) 2.206, other Federal agency interface (this is important for DLPM, not PM).
(2) 50.59 evaluation reviews.
(3) Review of inspection reports.
(4) Maine Yankee, Millstone lessons learned.
(5) Support for Congressional Affairs.
8. Reasons these activities are less important (7).
(1) Not supportive of outcome goals and primary licensing action work.
9. Any activities projects organization should not perform?
(1) None identified.
10. Additional input.
See 11.
11. Other issues.
(1) Dedicated project manager for plant is key ingredient for success.
—In some cases 1 PM could handle more than 1 plant (if plants were similar)
—is billing an issue?
—varies by commonality of licensing tasks
—varies with workload
—decision to assign PM to more than 1 plant, and assignment of significant co-lateral duties should include licensee input
—NRR needs to have flexibility.
(2) TIA process.
—need licensee involvement to provide information for NRR consideration.
—currently little communication with licensee until decision is made.
(3) Better coordination of generic issues—need for generic issue project managers, not necessarily plant PMs.
(4) Should review 72 items against the priorities in Question 2.

[FR Doc. 99–21397 Filed 8–17–99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Proposed Data Collection Available for Public Comment and Recommendations

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of

the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the railroad Retirement Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are Invited on:

(a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Title and Purpose of Information-Collecting

Gross Earnings Reports; OMB 3220–0132.

In order to carry out the financial interchange provisions of section 7(c)(2) of the Railroad Retirement Act (RRA), the RRB obtains annually from railroad employer's the gross earnings for their employees on a one-percent basis, i.e., 1% of each employer's railroad employees. The gross earnings sample is based on the earnings of employees whose social security numbers end with the digits ''30.'' the gross earnings are used to compute payroll taxes under the financial interchange.

The gross earnings information is essential in determining the tax amounts involved in the financial interchange with the Social Security Administration and Health Care Financing Administration. Besides being necessary for current financial interchange calculations, the gross earnings file tabulations are also an integral part of the data needed to estimate future tax income and corresponding financial interchange amounts. These estimates are made for internal use and to satisfy requests from other government agencies and interested groups. In addition, cash flow projections of the social security equivalent benefit account, railroad retirement account and cost estimates made for proposed amendments to laws administered by the RRB are dependent on input developed from the information collection.

The RRB utilizes Form BA–11 or its electronic equivalent to obtain gross earnings information from railroad employers. One response is requested of each railroad employer. Completion is mandatory.

No changes are proposed to Form BA–11.

Estimate of Annual Respondent Burden

Gross earnings reports are required annually from all employers reporting railroad service and compensation. There are approximately 633 railroad employers who currently report gross earnings to the RRB. Most large railroad employers include their railroad subsidiaries in their gross earnings reports. This results in the RRB collecting *less* than 633 earnings reports. Also, there are a large number of railroad employers have worked forces so small that they do not have employees with social security numbers ending in ''30.'' Currently, there are 382 such employers in this category who file ''negative'' BA–11 responses to the RRB. Overall, on an annual basis, the RRB receives 16 reports consisting of computer prepared tapes or diskettes and 138 by means of manually prepared Form BA–11. The RRB estimates an average preparation time of 5 hours for each gross earnings report submitted by computer tape or diskette and 30 minutes for each manually prepared BA–11.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS: To request more information or to obtain a copy of the information collection justification, forms, and/or supporting material, please call the RRB clearance Officer at (312) 751–3363. Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 N. Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611–2092. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Chuck Mierzwa,

Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 21374 Filed 8–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application to Withdraw From Listing and Registration; (Intertape Polymer Group Inc., Common Stock, Without Nominal or Par Value) File No. 1–10928

August 11, 1999.

Intertape Polymer Group Inc. (''Company'') has filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') and Rule 12d2–2(d) promulgated thereunder, to withdraw the security specified above (''Security'') from listing and registration on the American Stock Exchange LLC (''Amex'' or ''Exchange'').

The Security has been listed for trading on the Amex and, pursuant to a Registration Statement on Form 8–A filed with the Commission on August 6, 1999, is slated to become listed on the New York Stock Exchange (''NYSE''). Trading in the Securities on the NYSE is expected to commence on or about August 16, 1999.

The Company has complied with the rules of the Amex by filing with the Exchange a certified copy of the resolutions adopted by the Company's Board of Directors authorizing the withdrawal of its Security from listing on the Exchange and by setting forth in detail to the Amex the reasons for such proposed withdrawal, and the facts in support thereof. The Amex has in turn informed the Company that it will not interpose any objection to the withdrawal of the Company's Security from listing on the Exchange.

In making the decision to withdraw its Security from listing on the Amex and to list it instead on the NYSE, the Company has stated its belief that listing on the NYSE will benefit its shareholders by providing the Security exposure to a larger trading market.

The Company's application relates solely to the withdrawal of the Security from listing on the Amex and shall have no effect upon the pending listing of the Security on the NYSE. Moreover, by reason of Section 12(b) of the Act and the rules and regulations of the Commission thereunder, the Company would continue to be obligated to file reports with the Commission and the NYSE under Section 13 and other applicable sections of the Act.

Any interested person may, on or before September 1, 1999, submit by letter to the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549–0609, facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of the Exchange and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the Commission for the protection of investors. The Commission, based on the information submitted to it, will issue an order granting the application after the date mentioned above, unless the Commission determines to order a hearing on the matter.