

after the new treatment technology is installed.

2. EPA requests comment on whether it is more appropriate to base its affordability determination on the incremental costs of treatment for the system at the 10th percentile or the 50th percentile of system size in each small system category.

3. EPA requests comment on what the most appropriate national-level percentage threshold is (i.e., 0.25 percent, 0.50 percent, or 0.75 percent of the median MHI among small systems within a size category).

4. EPA requests comment on the key factors considered in developing affordability methodology options as described in section III.C of this notice. Do commenters believe these are the appropriate factors to consider? Are there other factors commenters would suggest the Agency consider?

5. EPA requests comment on whether the Agency should use a two-part test to screen at the national and county levels for systems that cannot afford compliance. Additionally, EPA seeks comment on whether the county or a different level is the appropriate unit of analysis for the second part of this test. The approach would first compare the incremental household cost of compliance to a national income-based threshold. If EPA were to find compliance affordable at the national level, we would then identify counties that are economically at-risk based on three socioeconomic triggers (MHI less than or equal to 65 percent of the national MHI, a U.S. Census Bureau-defined poverty rate at least twice the national average, or a two-year average unemployment rate at least twice the two-year national average). EPA also requests comment on the specific triggers that should be used to identify economically at-risk counties.

6. EPA requests comment upon its interpretation of affordability in section III.D.3 of today's notice. That is, should EPA consider variance technologies affordable even when they do not fall below the affordability threshold in cases where there would otherwise be no affordable variance technologies to list.

7. EPA requests comment on implementation challenges to States in reviewing and issuing small system variances.

8. EPA requests comment on finding a variance technology to be protective of public health if the concentration of the target contaminant after treatment by the variance technology is no more than three times the MCL unless unusual factors associated with the contaminant or EPA's risk assessment suggest that an

alternate level is appropriate, in which case EPA would explain its basis for the alternate level and request public comment in the proposed rule. EPA requests comment on whether a finding that variance technologies are protective of public health if they achieve a contaminant level within three times the MCL should be "capped" at a particular risk level (i.e.,  $10^{-3}$ ) in order to provide further assurance that variance technologies are in fact protective.

The Agency also requests comment on any other issue raised by this notice on options for revising its national-level affordability methodology or its methodology for determining if a variance technology is protective of public health.

## VII. References

- National Drinking Water Advisory Council (NDWAC). 2003. Recommendations of the National Drinking Water Advisory Council to U.S. EPA on Its National Small Systems Affordability Criteria. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/ndwac/council.html>.
- Rubin, Scott, J. 2001. White Paper for National Rural Water Association, Criteria to Assess the Affordability of Water Service. Available at <http://www.nrwa.org>.
- Rubin, Scott, J. 2002. White Paper for National Rural Water Association, Criteria to Assess Affordability Concerns in Conference Report for H.R. 2620. Available at <http://www.nrwa.org>.
- U.S. EPA. 1998. Announcement of Small System Compliance Technology Lists for Existing National Primary Drinking Water Regulations and Findings Concerning Variance Technologies. Notice. **Federal Register** Vol 63, No. 151, p. 42032. August 6, 1998. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/standard/clistfrn.pdf>.
- U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB). 2002. Affordability Criteria for Small Drinking Water Systems: An EPA Science Advisory Report. EPA-SAB-EEAC-03-004, U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board, Washington, DC, December 2002. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/sab>.

Dated: February 14, 2006.

**Benjamin H. Grumbles,**

*Assistant Administrator, Office of Water.*

[FR Doc. 06-1917 Filed 3-1-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

### Notice of Meetings; Sunshine Act

**AGENCY:** Federal Election Commission.

**PREVIOUSLY SCHEDULED DATE AND TIME:** Thursday, February 23, 2006, meeting open to the public. The following item was withdrawn from the agenda: Final audit report on CWA COPE political contributions committee.

**PREVIOUSLY SCHEDULED DATE AND TIME:** Tuesday, February 28, 2006. Meeting open to the public. This meeting was cancelled.

**DATE AND TIME:** Tuesday, March 7, 2006 at 10 a.m.

**PLACE:** 999 E Street, NW., Washington, DC.

**STATUS:** This meeting will be closed to the public.

### ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED:

Compliance matters pursuant to 2

U.S.C. 437g.

Audits conducted pursuant to 2 U.S.C.

437g, § 438(b), and Title 26, U.S.C.

Matters concerning participation in civil actions or proceedings or arbitration.

Internal personnel rules and procedures or matters affecting a particular employee.

\* \* \* \* \*

**DATE AND TIME:** Thursday, March 9, 2006 at 10 a.m.

**PLACE:** 999 E Street, NW., Washington, DC (Ninth floor).

**STATUS:** This meeting will be open to the public.

### ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED:

Correction and Approval of Minutes.

Advisory Opinion 2006-01: Pac for a Change by Douglas Boxer, Committee Director.

Advisory Opinion 2006-02: Robert Titley by counsel, Robert F. Bauer and Judith L. Corley.

Advisory Opinion 2006-06: Francine Busby for Congress by Brandon Hall, Campaign Manager.

Final Rules and Explanation and Justification for the Definitions of "To Solicit" and "To Direct" (11 CFR 300.2(m) and (n)).

Explanation and Justification for the Final Rules on Municipal Elections (11 CFR 100.24(a)).

Routine Administrative Matters.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Robert Biersack, Press Officer. Telephone: (202) 694-1220.

**Mary W. Dove,**

*Secretary of the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 06-2027 Filed 2-28-06; 2:56 pm]

**BILLING CODE 6715-01-M**

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

### Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR part 225), and all other applicable statutes