

202–208–2106 with the required accommodations.

For more information about the conference, please contact Yvonne Bartoli at (202) 502–6054 ([yvonne.bartoli@ferc.gov](mailto:yvonne.bartoli@ferc.gov)) or Sarah McKinley at (202) 502–8004 ([sarah.mckinley@ferc.gov](mailto:sarah.mckinley@ferc.gov)).

**Magalie R. Salas,**  
Secretary.

## Appendix A

### *Current and Possible Future Procedures for Establishment and Approval of Electric Reliability Standards*

Technical Conference Agenda, November 18, 2005, 9:30 a.m.–3 p.m.

9:30 a.m.—Opening Remarks

Joseph T. Kelliher, FERC Chairman

9:45 a.m.—Introductions

Joseph McClelland, Director, Division of Reliability, Office of Markets, Tariffs, and Rates, FERC

9:50 a.m.—Panel I: Standard Setting: The Current NERC and Regional Council Roles and Future ERO and Regional Entity Roles—Views from NERC, Utilities, a Regional Council, and Canada  
Representatives of NERC, utilities, a regional council, and Canada will provide their views on:

- How you respond currently to NERC and Regional Council actions and how you plan to respond to the ERO's actions as it establishes, implements, and enforces reliability standards.
- The challenges you might face regarding any new process.

Panelists:

Rick Sergel, President-CEO, North

American Electric Reliability Council

Michael G. Morris, Chairman-President-CEO, American Electric Power, Inc.

David Mohre, Executive Director, Energy and Power Division, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

Allen Mosher, Director of Policy Analysis, American Public Power Association

Sam R. Jones, Vice President-Chief Operating Officer, Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.

Terry Boston, Executive Vice President, Power System Operations, Tennessee Valley Authority

Kim Warren, Manager, Regulatory Affairs, Ontario IMO

11:15 a.m.—Break

11:30 a.m.—Panel II: Standard Setting: The Views of Regional Councils on the Role of Regional Entities Under the Energy Policy Act of 2005

Under the EPAct of 2005, Regional Entities may propose regional standards or variances to the ERO, which after its review can then propose regional standards to the Commission for its approval. In addition, the ERO may delegate its enforcement authority to Regional Entities.

Representatives from regional reliability councils will give their perspectives on the following:

- What preparations are you making regarding the implementation of EPAct 2005?
- Are there any unique circumstances in the region that may impact the implementation of ERO standards? If so, what are they?
- What are your views on regional standards/variances?
- What are your views on regional compliance/enforcement?
- What are your views on the terms that are necessary to incorporate into the delegation agreements with the ERO?
- What challenges can you identify regarding delegation agreements with the ERO?

Panelists:

Paul Johnson, Director, Transmission System Engineering and Maintenance Management, American Electric Power (Representing Reliability First)

Edward Schwerdt, Executive Director, Northeast Power Coordinating Council  
William F. Reinke, President-CEO, Southeastern Electric Reliability Council, Inc.

Ken Wiley, President-CEO, Florida Reliability Coordinating Council, Inc.

Charles Yeung, Executive Director, Interregional Affairs, Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

Daniel Skaar, President, Midwest Reliability Organization

12:45 p.m.—1:30 p.m. LUNCH

1:30 p.m.—Panel III: Review of Industry Standards

Standards are developed by many industries throughout the United States to provide a common approach to promote best practices throughout that industry. This panel will elicit views from several different industry representatives and a regional council on their standards development process within the electric industry and what process the ERO might follow.

Panelists will provide their views on the following questions:

- What are the processes you use to develop standards?
- What do you believe are your successes? What are your challenges?
- How do you improve upon standards that are found to be deficient?
- What are the lessons learned from your process that would be useful for the Commission to utilize to assure high reliability in the electric power system?

Panelists:

Rick Sergel, President-CEO, North American Electric Reliability Council

Richard Wakefield, Past Chairman, Energy Policy Committee, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers-USA

Richard Barrett, Office of Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Bruce Ellsworth, Chair, New York State Reliability Council

Louise McCarren, CEO, Western Electricity Coordinating Council

2:45 p.m.—Concluding Remarks

[FR Doc. E5–6429 Filed 11–21–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RM98–1–000]

### Records Governing Off-the-Record Communications Public Notice

November 14, 2005.

This constitutes notice, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.2201(b), of the receipt of prohibited and exempt off-the-record communications.

Order No. 607 (64 FR 51222, September 22, 1999) requires Commission decisional employees, who make or receive a prohibited or exempt off-the-record communication relevant to the merits of a contested proceeding, to deliver to the Secretary, a copy of the communication, if written, or a summary of the substance of any oral communication.

Prohibited communications are included in a public, non-decisional file associated with, but not a part of, the decisional record of the proceeding. Unless the Commission determines that the prohibited communication and any responses thereto should become a part of the decisional record, the prohibited off-the-record communication will not be considered by the Commission in reaching its decision. Parties to a proceeding may seek the opportunity to respond to any facts or contentions made in a prohibited off-the-record communication, and may request that the Commission place the prohibited communication and responses thereto in the decisional record. The Commission will grant such a request only when it determines that fairness so requires. Any person identified below as having made a prohibited off-the-record communication shall serve the document on all parties listed on the official service list for the applicable proceeding in accordance with Rule 2010, 18 CFR 385.2010.

Exempt off-the-record communications are included in the decisional record of the proceeding, unless the communication was with a cooperating agency as described by 40 CFR 1501.6, made under 18 CFR 385.2201(e)(1)(v).

The following is a list of off-the-record communications recently received in the Office of the Secretary. The communications listed are grouped by docket numbers in ascending order. These filings are available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's website at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the eLibrary (FERRIS) link. Enter the docket number,

excluding the last three digits, in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact

FERC, Online Support at  
*FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll

free at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659.

Docket No.	Date received	Presenter or requester
Prohibited:		
1. Project No. 382-000 .....	11-7-05	Amy L. Fesnock.
2. Project Nos. 2539-000 and 12522-000 .....	10-31-05	Jude Pinelski <sup>1</sup> .
Exempt:		
1. CP05-92-000 .....	11-3-05	Hon. Ron LeLeux.
2. Project No. 2216-000 .....	11-2-05	Hon. Brian Higgins.
3. Project Nos. 2602-000 and 2692-000 .....	10-28-05	Hon. Charles H. Taylor.
4. Project No. 10395-000 .....	11-2-05	Hon. Geoff Davis.

<sup>1</sup> One of nineteen postcard "form" submittals in Docket Nos. P-2539-000 and P-12522-000 filed between 10/31/05 and 11/7/05.

**Magalie R. Salas,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E5-6418 Filed 11-21-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717-01-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[IN 165-1; FRL-7999-6]

### Adequacy Status of Vigo County, IN, 8-Hour Ozone Redesignation and Maintenance Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of adequacy.

**SUMMARY:** In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that EPA has found that the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the Vigo County, Indiana 8-hour ozone redesignation request and maintenance plan are adequate for conformity purposes. On March 2, 1999, the DC Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for conformity determinations until EPA has affirmatively found them adequate. As a result of our finding, Vigo County can use the motor vehicle emissions budgets from the submitted 8-hour ozone redesignation request and maintenance plan for future conformity determinations. These budgets are effective December 7, 2005. The finding and the response to comments will be available at EPA's conformity Web site: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/transp.htm>, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity").

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steven Rosenthal, Environmental Engineer, Criteria Pollutant Section (AR-18J), Air Programs Branch, Air and Radiation Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency,

Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6052, [rosenthal.steven@epa.gov](mailto:rosenthal.steven@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, whenever "we," "us" or "our" is used, we mean EPA.

#### Background

Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region 5 sent a letter to the Indiana Department of Environmental Management on October 25, 2005, stating that the motor vehicle emissions budgets for the year 2015, submitted in the Vigo County, Indiana 8-hour ozone redesignation request and maintenance plan, are adequate. This finding has been announced on EPA's conformity Web site: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/transp.htm>, (once there, click on the "Conformity" button, then look for "Adequacy Review of SIP Submissions for Conformity").

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's conformity rule requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects conform to state air quality implementation plans and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which we determine whether a SIP's motor vehicle emission budgets are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review, and it also should not be used to prejudge EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

We've described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in guidance (May 14, 1999 memo titled "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision"). We followed this guidance in making our adequacy determination.

Dated: November 10, 2005.

**Bharat Mathur,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 05-23091 Filed 11-21-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

### Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisition of Shares of Bank or Bank Holding Companies

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notices also will be available for inspection at the office of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than December 6, 2005.

**A. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis** (Jacqueline G. King, Community Affairs Officer) 90 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480-0291:

1. *Paul J. Hanisch*, Crosby, North Dakota; to acquire voting shares of Hanisch Bankshares, Ltd., Crosby, North Dakota and thereby indirectly acquire