headquartered in non-metropolitan counties?

(c) Principal service area of allocatees. Should the CDFI Fund endeavor to ensure that either: (i) A desired proportion of NMTC allocatees (as a percentage of the total number of allocatees) in any given NMTC allocation round is ''principally serving'' (i.e., making QLICIs in) non-metropolitan counties; or (ii) a desired proportion of NMTC allocation authority (as a percentage of the total dollar amount of allocation authority) in any given NMTC allocation round is provided to CDEs principally serving non-metropolitan counties? If so, what is the appropriate meaning of ''principally serving'' (e.g., 85 percent of total QLICIs made by the CDE, 50 percent of total QLICIs made by the CDE, or another calculation)?

(d) Location of QLICIs. Should the CDFI Fund endeavor to ensure that a desired proportion of QLICIs is provided in non-metropolitan counties, without consideration of where the CDE is headquartered or which counties (metropolitan vs. non-metropolitan) that it is principally serving?

2. ''*Proportionality.*'' Commentators are asked to consider, in accordance with one or more of the alternatives presented under issue 1 above, the most appropriate definition of the term ''proportional.''

(a) With respect to alternatives (a) and (d) under issue 1, should the CDFI Fund define the term ''proportional'' to mean: (i) The proportion of the U.S. population that resides in non-metropolitan areas (approximately 17.4 percent); (ii) the proportion of low-income communities that are located in non-metropolitan areas (approximately 25 percent); or (iii) another calculation?

(b) With respect to alternatives (b) and (c) under issue 1, should the proportion be based upon: (i) the total applicant pool for a given NMTC allocation round (for example, if 25 percent of the applicant pool consists of CDEs that predominantly serve non-metropolitan areas, the CDFI Fund would ensure that 25 percent of the allocatees predominantly serve rural areas); or (ii) that portion of the applicant pool that, after the first phase of application review and scoring, met or exceeded the minimum scoring threshold to be eligible for NMTC allocations?

(c) With respect to alternatives (c) and (d) under issue 1, should the percentage of QLICIs made in low-income communities be based upon the total number of QLICIs made by a CDE, or the total dollar amount of those QLICIs?

3. *Review Process.* Commentators are asked to consider what changes the CDFI Fund should consider making to the allocation application review and decision-making process. What modifications could be made to the CDFI Fund's review process to ensure that there is a proportional allocation of QEIs in non-metropolitan areas? For example:

(a) Priority points. In prior allocation rounds, the CDFI Fund has provided up to five priority points to applicants that demonstrated a track record of having successfully provided capital or technical assistance to disadvantaged businesses or communities, pursuant to IRC section 45D(f)(2). Should the CDFI Fund adopt priority points based on: (i) The CDE's track record of serving non-metropolitan areas (e.g., an applicant could get up to five priority points based on the percentage of its historic activities serving non-metropolitan areas); (ii) a forward-looking commitment to serving non-metropolitan areas (e.g., up to five points based on the percentage of activities that will be directed to non-metropolitan areas); or (iii) both the track record and the forward-looking commitments?

(b) Re-ranking of applicants. Should the CDFI Fund consider advancing lower scoring applicants that predominantly serve non-metropolitan areas over higher scoring applicants so that the desired proportionality is achieved?

4. *Compliance.* The CDFI Fund must have a mechanism to ensure that allocatees comply with any non-metropolitan area proportionality requirement. Commentators are asked to consider whether the CDFI Fund should require that applicants specify in their applications the percentage of their QEI proceeds that they will use to make investments in non-metropolitan areas and then be held to those percentages as a condition of their allocation agreements.

Authority: 26 U.S.C. 45D; Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006, Pub. L. 109–432; 26 CFR 1.45D–1.

Dated: May 16, 2007.

Kimberly A. Reed,

Director, Community Development Financial Institutions Fund.

[FR Doc. E7–9832 Filed 5–21–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Advisory Committee on Structural Safety of Department of Veterans Affairs Facilities; Notice of Meeting

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) gives notice under Public law 92–463 (Federal Advisory Committee Act) that a meeting of the Advisory Committee on Structural Safety of Department of Veterans Affairs Facilities will be held on June 14–15, 2007, in Room 4442, Export Import Bank, 811 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. The June 14 session will be from 9 a.m. until 5 p.m., and the June 15 session will be from 8:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. The meeting is open to the public.

The purpose of the Committee is to advise the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on matters of structural safety in the construction and remodeling of VA facilities and to recommend standards for use by VA in the construction and alteration of its facilities.

On June 14, the Committee will review developments in the fields of fire safety issues and structural design as they relate to seismic and other natural hazards, impact on the safety of buildings. On June 15, the Committee will receive appropriate briefings and presentations on current seismic, natural hazards and fire safety issues that are particularly relevant to facilities owned and leased by the Department. The Committee will also discuss appropriate structural and fire safety recommendations for inclusion in VA's standards.

No time will be allocated for receiving oral presentations from the public. However, the Committee will accept written statements. Statements should be sent to Krishna K. Banga, Senior Structural Engineer, Facilities Quality Service, Office of Construction & Facilities Management (00CFM1A), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420. Those wishing to attend should contact Mr. Banga at (202) 565–9370.

Dated: May 15, 2007.

By direction of the Secretary.

E. Philip Riggin,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 07–2516 Filed 5–21–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–07–M