

protected through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. The <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site is an "anonymous access" system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through <http://www.regulations.gov> your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses. For additional information about EPA's public docket visit the EPA Docket Center homepage at <http://www.epa.gov/epahome/dockets.htm>.

**Docket:** All documents in the docket are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the U.S. EPA Region 4 office located at 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303. Regional office is open from 7 a.m. until 6:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

Written comments may be submitted to Ms. Batchelor within 30 calendar days of the date of this publication.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paula V. Batchelor at 404/562-8887.

Dated: March 22, 2006.

**Rosalind H. Brown,**

Chief, Superfund Enforcement & Information Management Branch, Waste Management Division.

[FR Doc. 06-3131 Filed 3-30-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-M**

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

### Notice of Sunshine Act Meetings

**SPECIAL EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Tuesday, March 28, 2006, 10 a.m. This Meeting

Was Closed To The Public Pursuant To 11 CFR 2.4(b)(1) and 2.4(b)(2).

**PREVIOUSLY SCHEDULED OPEN MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 2006:** *The Meeting Hour Was Changed To 2 p.m.*

**DATE AND TIME:** Friday, April 7, 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.  
Final Rules on Coordinated Communications.  
Routine Administrative Matters.

**DATE AND TIME:** Monday, April 10, 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:**

Advisory Opinion 2006-07:  
Representative J. D. Hayworth on behalf of J. D. Hayworth for Congress.  
Advisory Opinion 2006-08: Matthew Brooks by counsel, Craig Engle.  
Advisory Opinion 2006-09: The American Institute for Certified Public Accountants and The American Institute for Certified Public Accounts Political Action Committee by counsel, Russell L. Smith.  
Audit Status—Title 26.

**OPEN MEETING, CONTINUED:**

Final Audit Report on CWA COPE  
Political Contributions Committee.  
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. 06-3153 Filed 3-29-06; 10:38 am]

**BILLING CODE 6715-01-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Office of the Secretary

#### Findings of Scientific Misconduct

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that on February 28, 2006, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Debarment Official, on behalf of the Secretary of HHS, issued a final notice of debarment based on the scientific misconduct findings of the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS) in the following case:

*Susan M. Aronica, PhD, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis:* Based on the evidence and findings of an investigation report by Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) and additional analysis conducted by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) in its oversight review, ORI found that Susan M. Aronica, Ph.D., former Postdoctoral Student/Fellow, IUPUI, committed 21 acts of scientific misconduct by knowingly and intentionally falsifying and fabricating data in her notebooks, in 17 figures and figure panels, in two tables published in the *Journal of Biological Chemistry* (*J. Biol. Chem.* 270:21998-22007, 1995) and *Blood* (*Blood* 89:3582-3595, 1997), and in two figures in a manuscript submitted for publication to *Blood* in August 1997.

ORI issued a charge letter enumerating the above findings of scientific misconduct. However, Dr. Aronica requested a hearing to dispute these findings to the Departmental Appeals Board. Based upon the insufficiency of Dr. Aronica's hearing request, ORI filed a Motion to Dismiss.

On February 10, 2006, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruled in ORI's favor by dismissing Dr. Aronica's request for a hearing. ORI's research misconduct regulation specifically delineates the requisite content for an acceptable hearing request. A sustainable hearing request must admit or deny each finding of research misconduct, and each denial must be detailed and substantive. 42 CFR 93.501(c). Dr. Aronica's hearing request contained only a general denial of the proposed findings. The regulation states that a general denial is not sufficient to establish a genuine dispute. 42 CFR 93.503. The regulation also states that the ALJ must dismiss a hearing request if the respondent does not raise a genuine dispute over facts or law material to the research misconduct findings. 42 CFR 93.504(a)(2). The ALJ concluded that the determination of whether the hearing request raises a genuine dispute is a threshold jurisdictional determination. Thus, the ALJ decided that Dr. Aronica's request did not show a genuine dispute, because it did not specifically deny any allegation. As a result, the ALJ concluded that Dr. Aronica's hearing request could not be granted, but was required to be dismissed pursuant to 42 CFR 93.504(a)(2).

Specifically, ORI found that Dr. Aronica falsified and fabricated data in:

- Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, and 6B, and Tables III and IV in: Aronica, S.M., Mantel, C., Gonin, R., Marshall, M.S., Sarris, A., Cooper, S.,