previously noted, EPA believes that the results of this analysis would be subject to revision based on new information and petitions from interested parties.

• EPA presented several options for the statutory prohibition in Section 1415(e)(6)(A) of the SDWA that was used as one of the screens. States preferred the lead option, which was that variance technologies might be available for those pre-1986 NPDWRs where the MCL was lowered after 1986. This lead option was used in the final two-stage screening process for variance technologies.

• Some stakeholders questioned whether any relief is being provided because the initial screening process left so few contaminants eligible for variance technologies. EPA emphasized that variances are intended to be the exception and that the goal is to bring as many water systems into compliance as possible. EPA also emphasized that the same procedures would be used for future regulations and that variance technologies might play a larger role in those regulations.

• A number of State attendees at both the May 1998 stakeholder meeting and the July 1997 stakeholder meeting have indicated that they did not think there was a need for variance technologies for the existing regulations in their State. Ten States attended the July 1997 stakeholder meeting and heard the initial discussion on variance technologies.

Another topic discussed at the stakeholder meeting on May 18, 1998 was the national-level affordability criteria. This topic was broken into three parts: an overview, establishment of the baseline, and options for the affordability threshold. The comments on this topic were concentrated on the development of the baseline and the identification of the range of options for national-level affordability criteria. The major comments are summarized below:

• Baseline values were determined for three parameters: annual household water consumption, median household income, and current annual water bills. Stakeholders were asked if separate baselines should be established for ground water and surface water systems. Stakeholders stated that separate baselines should be established, but that the distinction between ground water and surface water systems was less significant in small systems because most rely on ground water. EPA evaluated the data and determined that there was very little distinction between ground water systems and surface water systems, so separate baselines were not established.

• Stakeholders were asked if there were other mechanisms to estimate median household income (MHI) for customers served by small water systems. One stakeholder suggested using lower income levels instead of the median. EPA stated that the national-level affordability criteria should describe the characteristics of typical systems and typical households and should not address extreme situations where costs might be extremely low or excessively burdensome. The median was chosen because it is a measure of central tendency. EPA also noted that it did not have data on current water bills and annual household water consumption for households with lower income levels. EPA stated that it would be inconsistent to use the median values for existing water bills and annual consumption with lower income levels.

• Stakeholders were also asked if mean or median values for the three parameters should be used in establishing the national-level affordability criteria. Stakeholders recommended consistency rather than a preference for using means or medians. Median values were used for all three parameters.

• An initial range for the affordability threshold was identified at the meeting. This range was from 1.5% to 3% MHI. Stakeholders, in general, did not express a strong opinion about where the affordability threshold should be set within that range. One State offered that 1.5% should be used, since it was the lowest value within the range. EPA selected 2.5% based on the rationale described in Part A of this Section.

At the end of the meeting, EPA indicated that it would accept comments on the two-stage screening process and the national-level affordability criteria through the middle of June. EPA stated that comments received by then could be incorporated into the analysis to determine their impact. EPA did not receive any comments from stakeholders after the meeting on either the screening process or the national-level affordability criteria.

Dated: July 31, 1998.

J. Charles Fox,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Water Environmental Protection Agency.

[FR Doc. 98–21032 Filed 8–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket No. 92–237; DA 98–1529]

Next Meeting of the North American Numbering Council

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On July 31, 1998, the Commission released a public notice announcing the August 19–20, 1998, meeting and agenda of the North American Numbering Council (NANC). The intended effect of this action is to make the public aware of the NANC's next meeting and its Agenda.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Simms, at (202) 418–2330 or via the Internet at lsimms@fcc.gov or Jeannie Grimes at (202) 418–2313 or jgrimes@fcc.gov. The address is: Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 2000 M Street, NW, Suite 235, Washington, DC 20554. The fax number is: (202) 418–7314. The TTY number is: (202) 418–0484.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Released: July 31, 1998.

The next meeting of the North American Numbering Council (NANC) will be held on Wednesday, August 19, from 8:30 a.m., until 5:00 p.m., and on Thursday, August 20, 1998, from 8:30 a.m., until 12 noon at the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW, Room 856, Washington, D.C.

This meeting will be open to members of the general public. The FCC will attempt to accommodate as many people as possible. Admittance, however will be limited to the seating available. The public may submit written statements to the NANC, which must be received two business days before the meeting. In addition, oral statements at the meeting by parties or entities not represented on the NANC will be permitted to the extent time permits. Such statements will be limited to five minutes in length by any one party or entity, and requests to make an oral statement must be received two business days before each meeting. Requests to make an oral statement or provide written comments to the NANC should be sent to Linda Simms at the address under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT,** stated above.

Proposed Agenda

The planned agenda for the August 19–20, meeting is as follows:

1. Approval of meeting minutes
2. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report.
3. N11 Ad Hoc Working Group Report. Progress update on recommendation development pursuant to the *First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,* In the Matter of Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements, CC Docket 92–105, FCC 97–51.
4. Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group Report.
5. Industry Numbering Committee Report.
6. Cost Recovery Working Group Report.
7. North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Oversight Working Group Report.
8. COCUS and Proposed Line Number Utilization Survey. Further discussion and review of contributions on question of a rule or clarification of existing rule for reporting utilization data. Discussion will focus on possible enforcement mechanism; audits; forecasts from resellers; appeals and confidentiality issues.
9. Discussion of Chairman Hasselwander's proposal on how to manage future deliberations and interactions with the North American Numbering Plan Administrator on issue of net costs associated with extension to 1000s block number pooling administration.
10. State NPA Issue.
11. Referral from Ordering and Billing Forum.
12. Tutorial—Law Enforcement Issues.
13. Other Business.

Federal Communications Commission.

Geraldine A. Matise,

Chief, Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

[FR Doc. 98–21083 Filed 8–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that at 4:37 p.m. on Friday, July 31, 1998, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation met in closed session to consider a matter relating to the Corporation's corporate activities.

In calling the meeting, the Board determined, on motion of Vice Chairman Andrew C. Hove, Jr., seconded by Director Joseph H. Neely (Appointive), concurred in by Director Ellen S. Seidman (Director, Office of Thrift Supervision), Director Julie L. Williams (Acting Comptroller of the Currency), and Chairman Donna Tanoue, that Corporation business required its consideration of the matter on less than seven days' notice to the public; that no earlier notice of the meeting was practicable; that the public interest did not require consideration of the matter in a meeting open to public observation; and that the matter could be considered in a closed meeting by authority of subsections (c)(9)(B) and (c)(10) of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(9)(B) and (c)(10)).

The meeting was held in the Board Room of the FDIC Building located at 550 17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC.

Dated: July 31, 1998.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

James D. LaPierre,

Deputy Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–21110 Filed 8–3–98; 5:02 pm]

BILLING CODE 6714–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Administration for Children and Families

Reallotment of FY 1997 Funds for Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)

AGENCY: Office of Community Services, ACF, DHHS.

ACTION: Notice of determination concerning funds available for reallotment.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a preliminary determination has been made that fiscal year (FY) 1997 Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) funds are available for reallotment *to States, territories, and tribes and tribal organizations receiving FY 1998 direct LIHEAP funding* Section 2607(b)(1) of Low Income Home Energy Assistance Act (the Act), Title XXVI of Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 *et seq.*), as amended, requires that if the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services determines that, as of September 1 of any fiscal year, an amount in excess of certain levels allotted to a grantee for any fiscal year will not be used by the grantee during the fiscal year, the Secretary must notify the grantee and publish a notice in the **Federal Register** that such funds may be reallotted to LIHEAP grantees during the following fiscal year. (No funds may be alloted to entities that are not direct LIHEAP grantees during FY 1998.) It has been determined that $82,025 may be available for reallotment during FY 1997. This determination is based on a revised report from the State of Alabama, which was submitted to the Office of Community Services as required by 45 CFR 96.82.

The statute allows grantees who have funds unobligated at the end of the fiscal year for which they are awarded to request that they be allowed to carry over up to 10 percent of their allotments to the next fiscal year. Funds in excess of this amount must be returned to DHHS and are subject to reallotment under section 2607(b)(1) if the Act, The amount described in this notice was reported as unobligated FY 1997 funds in excess of the amount that the State of Alabama could carry over to FY 1998.

The State of Alabama was notified by certified mail that $82,025 of its FY 1997 funds may be reallotted. In accordance with section 2607(b)(3), the Chief Executive Officer of the State of Alabama has 30 days from the date of the letter to submit comments to: Donald Sykes, Director, Office of Community Services, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, Washington, DC 20047. The comment period expires August 31, 1998.

After considering any comments submitted, the Chief Executive Officer will be notified of the decision, and the decision also will be published in the **Federal Register**. If funds are reallocated, they will be allocated in accordance with section 2604 of the Act and must be treated by LIHEAP grantees receiving them as an amount appropriated for FY 1998. As FY 1998 funds, they will be subject to all requirements of the Act, including section 2607(b)(2), which requires that a grantee obligate at least 90% of its total block grant allocation for a fiscal year by the end of the fiscal year for which the funds are appropriated, that is, by September 30, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Janet Fox, Director, Divison of Energy Assistance, Office of Community Services, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, Washington, DC 20447; telephone (202) 401–9351.

Dated: July 29, 1998.

Donald Sykes,

Director, Office of Community Services.

[FR Doc. 98–21078 Filed 8–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184–01–M