Date: July 10–11, 1995.
Time: 8:00 a.m.
Place: Crowne Plaza, Rockville, MD.
Contact Person: Dr. Nadarajen Vydelingum, Scientific Review Admin., 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5210, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1176.

Name of SEP: Multidisciplinary Sciences.
Date: July 10–11, 1995.
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Place: Crowne Plaza, Rockville, MD.
Contact Person: Dr. Harish Chopra, Scientific Review Administrator, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5112, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1169.

Name of SEP: Multidisciplinary Sciences.
Date: July 12–14, 1995.
Time: 8:00 a.m.
Place: Crowne Plaza, Rockville, MD.
Contact Person: Dr. Bill Bunnag, Scientific Review Administrator, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5212, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1177.

Name of SEP: Multidisciplinary Sciences.
Date: July 17–18, 1995.
Time: 8:00 a.m.
Place: Ritz-Carlton, Tysons Corner, VA.
Contact Person: Dr. Eileen Bradley, Scientific Review Admin., 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5120, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1179.

Name of SEP: Behavioral and Neurosciences.
Date: July 21, 1995.
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Place: Hyatt Regency Hotel, Bethesda.
Contact Person: Dr. Peggy McCardle, Scientific Review Admin., 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5198, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1258.

Name of SEP: Multidisciplinary Sciences.
Date: July 24, 1995.
Time: 8:00 a.m.
Place: Embassy Suites, Washington, DC.
Contact Person: Dr. Eileen Bradley, Scientific Review Admin., 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5120, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1179.

The meetings will be closed in accordance with the provisions set forth in secs. 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5, U.S.C. Applications and/or proposals and the discussions could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information concerning individuals associated with the applications and/or proposals, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: May 24, 1995.

Susan K. Feldman,

Committee Management Officer, NIH.

[FR Doc. 95–13278 Filed 5–30–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

Office of the Secretary

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; Linking State Administrative Data

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HHS.

ACTION: Request for applications for grants to support State efforts to link case-level administrative data across multiple low-income assistance programs.

SUMMARY: Recent state efforts to link longitudinal, administrative data across programs have proven extremely successful. Linked databases have provided a more thorough understanding of many aspects of both program participation and the characteristics of individuals who receive benefits from multiple anti-poverty programs. State-supported efforts have also provided valuable insight into both inter- and intra-state variations in program participation. Much of this information would not have been accessible through national panel data.

While the efforts of individual states have been extremely valuable, they have been limited to relatively few states. Factors such as prohibitive cost, lack of necessary staff expertise, and insufficient time and computational resources have precluded many interested states from linking their administrative data. Total funding of up to $200,000 is available to provide one to two interested states with resources needed to successfully link administrative data and use it for program management, research and scholarly analysis. It is not expected that the funding available in this grant will be sufficient for any state to complete a project that links micro-level administrative data. Rather, this grant is intended to assist those states which are interested in linking their administrative data, but currently lack the resources to successfully complete the project on their own.

Part I. Linking State Administrative Data

A. Background:

In the last five years, several states have begun assembling administrative data from income-maintenance and other programs targeted toward low-income individuals and families for use in policy research and program evaluation. Most notably, administrative data that has been linked from a variety of anti-poverty programs has been used to study characteristics of program participation, multi-service usage, and caseload dynamics. The results from many of these research initiatives have provided an extremely useful insight into the characteristics of program participants, the patterns of multi-service utilization, and the interactions between multiple programs that provide assistance to low-income families.

Administrative data also offer more possibilities for in-depth analysis than do other forms of data, such as national panel data. Many national studies do not give reliable state-level estimates, particularly in smaller states with relatively few sampling points. As a result, it is generally quite difficult to estimate the state-level effects of national anti-poverty programs. State administrative data offer the opportunity to study inter- and intra-state comparisons of government programs, and to examine the extent to which variations in state anti-poverty programs are successful in serving various client populations.

Usefulness of Project

The research that has been conducted to date has illustrated the efficacy in using linked administrative data for research and evaluation. In the vast majority of states, however, the use of linked data still remains either untouched or far below what is technically possible. A study funded by the Department surveyed fifteen states and determined that, for the majority of the states surveyed, linked administrative data is a potentially rich source of information about programs targeted toward low-income populations.

Despite the potential of state administrative data, the Department's previous findings indicate that linked, state-level program data still remains a vastly under-utilized source of information. Many states have both the interest and raw administrative data necessary to produce longitudinally-linked files at the case or client level. However, as the process of linking data across programs and over time is an expensive, iterative process that requires significant time and expertise, many states lack the capacity to link their data. Some states lack the computer hardware, software, disk space, and memory necessary to actually perform the process of linking data. Other states lack the expertise and staff-time to devote energy to a research project. Many states face both of these obstacles.

This grant will help the selected states overcome the obstacles that hinder the process of linking administrative data. For example, states with limited data-linking experience and capacity could add the hardware and software needed to link and store data. States with more experience (such as those which currently operate linked, research data bases) could use the funds to add administrative data from additional anti-poverty programs.

Part II. Awardee Responsibilities

Due to the substantial variation among states in the level of experience and expertise in working with linked administrative data, we fully expect a wide range of proposals to be submitted. Proposals from states which currently have linked administrative databases will obviously differ dramatically from proposals submitted by states with which have never worked with linked data. Given this, the specific responsibilities of the awardees may vary. Each state will, however, be expected to follow the following guidelines:

1. Each applicant must develop the computer systems and technical capacity necessary to produce longitudinal, linked administrative micro-level data. The focus of the data may be on cases, households, clients, filing units, etc., or any combination thereof. For those applicants which currently have linked data bases, it is expected that this grant will provide the resources necessary to significantly enhance their current data systems.

2. Each applicant must link administrative data from at least two programs that primarily benefit low-income individuals or families. The states that currently operate linked, administrative research databases began by focusing on data from the AFDC, Medicaid and Food Stamps computer systems, largely because these data operating systems for these programs were fairly compatible due to the interactions between the programs. States in the early stages of data linking may choose to focus on these programs, but links between other programs are also strongly encouraged. Other administrative data that states may choose to link include: Child welfare and foster care, child support enforcement, unemployment insurance, vital statistics, disability, SSI and income tax data. Linkages between these programs are especially encouraged, as they will likely provide fresh insight into the interactions over time among these programs.

3. Each applicant must develop the capacity and knowledge necessary to prepare and standardize data for program management and scholarly analysis. The data resulting from this grant should be able to support policy research and program evaluation, and should provide insight into a variety of policy relevant concerns. Data-sets should support research into questions concerning (but not limited to) multi-program participation and usage, interactions between various anti-poverty programs, caseload dynamics, recidivism, fraud and abuse, and the demographic, economic and social characteristics of multi-program participants.

4. In addition to preparing the data in a manner suitable for program administration and scholarly research, applicants must demonstrate an ability to actually utilize the data analytically. Linked administrative data allow for a great variety of analysis. For example, files linked longitudinally can be studied with event-history and survivor analysis, methods which are used to understand caseload dynamics and determine how the sequence of service events affects a client's outcomes. Additionally, since administrative data typically have more complete and detailed information than panel data, administrative data analysis can more accurately assess the demographic and social characteristics of multi-service users. Administrative data can also be used to do detailed geographic analysis, which is helpful in studying whether there are significant variations in service usage across different administrative regions or across neighborhoods.

It is necessary for applicants to detail exactly how their linked data can be used for scholarly analysis. States with larger social service departments may have researchers on staff who possess the skills necessary to fully explore the data. Other states may wish to combine their efforts with an academic or policy research organization with expertise in data analysis. Both of these alternatives, as well as others, would be acceptable. It is not our intent to limit the analytical choices of applicants, but rather to ensure that the data sets created under this grant are used to their full potential.

5. Applicants must obtain written agreements with all state or county social service departments that will supply the source data. The agreement should clearly indicate the responsibilities of both the applicants and the state or county agency, and the willingness of the parties to work cooperatively. Applicants must also include a plan which ensures that the resulting linked Data ensure client confidentiality.

6. Applicants must demonstrate an ongoing commitment to the project. A principal use of these data is to study current policy relevant questions about programs for low-income populations. Data for answering current questions are most useful when they capture current effects of such programs. Consistent with their on-going commitment to data linking and analysis, applicants must ensure that both recent historical data and new case data will be added after the Federal funding for this project expires.

Part III. Prerequisites, Content of Application, Review Process, and Evaluation Criteria

A. Prerequisites

Who may apply? We will only accept applications from state agencies, large urban county agencies, or universities working with them. This announcement is aimed primarily at states that can link statewide data bases. Applications will also be considered from large urban county governments that can clearly demonstrate the ability to link administrative databases in a way that could provide data of national policy relevance. University-based research teams that are working with state agencies to develop linked data bases may apply but must provide assurances from the state that they are intimately involved in developing and utilizing the data base for policy purposes.

What data bases? Applicants must clearly demonstrate the ability to link at least two micro (person, family, or case) files and at least be in the midst of analyzing data for policy research or evaluation purposes. Examples of files that have been linked in other situations are: AFDC, Medicaid, Child Welfare and Foster care, Unemployment Insurance, Child Support, Individual Income Tax, Vital Statistics, and Juvenile Courts. At a minimum, linked data bases must allow for at least three years of longitudinal analysis.

On-going commitment? The state agency responsible for establishing the linked data system must provide evidence of an on-going commitment to developing the data base and using it to understand poverty, program utilization, caseload dynamics, program effectiveness, and other important aspects of administration of anti-poverty, employment, and welfare programs. Applicants that do not provide assurances that all three of these prerequisites will be fulfilled will be unacceptable.

B. Applicant Content

The application shall include the following elements:

1. Abstract

A one page abstract of the project and its objectives.

2. Goals and Justification for Project

This section will discuss why the agency wishes to undertake the project and what the short and long-term goals of the project are. The applicant should discuss the background of what it has been doing to support linking administrative data bases, the current status of data base development, and what it expects to accomplish with this project. It should discuss what analysis will be completed given completion of the project, the analytical report that will be produced, and what policy relevance it will have. States should also present their plans, if any, to produce a public use dataset as a result of this project.

Linking two or more administrative data bases for analytical purposes is a complicated and difficult endeavor. It often can take several iterations of refinement to produce a data base that supports analysis of more than simple descriptive statistics about the caseload. This section should discuss where the agency is in the evolution of the linking and embedding policy analysis in the administrative management of the programs involved. It should contain a discussion of how the agency will carry on after this funding is exhausted. For applicants who are not currently linking databases, they should clearly demonstrate their knowledge of the process, as well as their plans to obtain the necessary expertise to successfully carry out their proposed project.

3. Project Design and Approach

In this section, the applicant will discuss what, if any, data are currently linked, what will be added through this grant, and how it will be accomplished. This section should describe what variables are available and will be added, what length of time period is covered, what kind of data analysis currently can be done, and what analytical capability will be added by this project. The discussion should make it clear to the reader what is the structure of the data, what are the building blocks (individuals, families, households, cases, filing units, etc.), the universe of state population covered, the types of variables (demographic, program participation, program dynamics, costs, etc.) that can be used for analysis. The applicant should also clearly specify how the micro-level data will be linked and how the retrospective case files will be assembled. Does a unique identifier exist that will allow data to be easily linked across programs? If not, what variable or record-matching technique will be employed? It also should make clear what information is not available, and the limitations this poses for policy-relevant analysis.

If applicants are not currently linking any administrative data, then they should assure reviewers that they have adequate access to at least three years of recent historical administrative data. Applicants should also convince reviewers that they have the expertise needed to complete the project, and also have the commitment to continue linking administrative data for research, analysis, and program management purposes.

The treatment of confidentiality and proper disclosure is a very important issue related to linking data and analyzing it. The applicants will discuss how they will protect data from improper disclosure, and how they will facilitate analytical use of sensitive data. This section will discuss the time table to accomplish this project. Who will do what, when, and how? It also will discuss what will be the end product of this project. What sort of report will be produced? What policy relevance will it have to the state and to DHHS?

4. Organization and Staffing

The application will describe the organization applying for the grant. If the applicant is a state agency, where does it fit in the state organization? What are its responsibilities? What are its capabilities and limitations? How can it assure that this project will be embedded in the state's policy analysis system?

The applicant will discuss the staffing for the project. Who will be the project leader? What are the qualifications of the staff and who will be involved? What are their time commitments to the project and what other time commitments do they have that might interfere with successful completion of the project? Personal vita and job descriptions should be attached as an appendix to the application.

If a university group is involved in the project, the application will clearly delineate what the responsibilities of the group will be and how the state agency will exercise control over their work. It will describe the mechanism (subcontract, etc.) used to procure the university group services.

5. Budget

This section will include a budget summary and narrative which describes how the budget supports the research plan. It should show the financial contribution made or expected by other funding sources, and the share of total project costs covered by ASPE's grant. It will discuss how the overall funding level and federal contribution relate to the successful completion of the project. The actual budget will be presented on the forms and in accordance with the requirements discussed in the section entitled ''Components of a Complete Application.''

6. Commitment of State

Applicants should use this section to completely describe the resources the state has already committed to the project. If the state has not yet established support for the project, then applicants should discuss any future involvement expected of the state. Resources contributed by the state could include any financial assistance (and whether it is an outright cash grant or is targeted for a specific purchase such as computing equipment), allocation of staff or computing time, technical assistance, and any other relevant contribution.

C. Review Process and Evaluation Criteria

A technical panel of at least three people will review and score those applications which are submitted by the deadline, and which meet the screening and prerequisite requirements. The review will be based on the criteria listed below. The review of the technical proposal and budget will be used by the Assistant Secretary in making funding decisions. ASPE reserves the option to discuss the application and the state agency record of performance with other agencies, Regional Office staff, and experts who may have information that could assist the selection process.

The evaluation criteria correspond to the outline for the development of the Program Narrative Statement of the application. Although not mandatory, it is strongly recommended that applications be prepared with the format indicated by this outline.

Selection of the successful applicant(s) will be based on the technical and financial criteria laid out in this announcement. Reviewers will determine the strengths and weaknesses of each application in terms of the evaluation criteria listed below, provide comments and assign numerical scores. The review panel will prepare a summary of all applicant scores and strengths/weaknesses and recommendations and submit it to the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation for final decisions on the award.

The point value following each criterion heading indicates the maximum numerical weight that each section will be given in the review process. An unacceptable rating on any individual criterion may render the application unacceptable. Consequently, applicants should take care to ensure that all criteria are fully addressed in the applications. Applications will be reviewed as follows:

(a) Quality of the goals and Project Justification. (See Part B, Type of Application Requested, Section 2.) (15 points) Applications will be judged on whether they provide a thoughtful and coherent discussion of the need for the project and what it will accomplish. Reviewers will judge applicant's past, current, and future commitment to linking administrative data for policy analysis, research, and evaluation. Particular attention will be given to the agency's commitment to scholarly, policy-relevant work, and their commitment to producing a public use dataset as a result of this project.

(b) Quality of the project design and approach. (See Part B, Section 3.) (35 points) Reviewers will judge this section on the basis of whether the research agenda is scientifically sound and policy relevant. They will also consider whether the applicant is likely to make a significant contribution to understanding such important issues as program utilization and effectiveness, caseload dynamics, types of clients, and multiple program participation. Applications will be rated on their plans to conduct policy relevant research and interact with various levels of government to research and evaluate significant government initiatives and policies.

Reviewers will assess the completeness of the data bases linked, population coverage, and the extensiveness of the variables in the data base. A proposal with more data bases linked will be rated higher than one with only two program databases, all other factors being constant. Evidence of data quality control and validity is also extremely important. Ratings will consider the thoroughness of the discussion of the database strengths and weaknesses. Reviewers will assess whether there is appropriate use and protection of sensitive or confidential data. The type and quality of end product anticipated from this project will be considered and rated. Finally, reviewers will rate the feasibility of the workplan and time schedule.

(c) Quality of the staffing proposal and proposed organizational arrangements. (See Part B, Section 4.) (35 points) Reviewers will judge applicant's staff on research experience, demonstrated research skills, public administration experience, and relevant policy-research and policy-making skills. Ratings may consider references on prior research projects. Staff time commitments to the project also will be a factor in the evaluation. Furthermore, reviewers will rate the applicant's pledge and ability to produce a database capable of supporting policy-relevant analysis.

Reviewers will evaluate the track record of the lead agency ability to support scholarly, policy relevant research that can meet the demands of the academic, research, and policy communities.

If a university group is involved in the project, raters will judge the administrative relationships between the group and the state agency and whether the administrative arrangements can assure quality data and analysis.

(d) Appropriateness of the budget to carry out the planned staffing and activities. (See Part B, Section 5.) (15 points) Ratings will consider whether: (a) The budget assures an efficient and effective allocation of funds to achieve the objectives of this solicitation and (2) the applicant has appropriate financial commitment from the state and the university, if one is involved.

State Single Point of Contact (E.O. No. 12372): The Department of Health and Human Services has determined that this program is not subject to Executive Order No. 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, because it is a program that is national in scope and the only impact on State and local governments would be through subgrants. Applicants are not required to seek intergovernmental review of their applications within the constraints of E.O. No. 12372.

Deadline for Submission of Applications: The closing date for submission of applications under this announcement is July 31, 1995. Applications must be postmarked or hand-delivered to the application receipt point no later than 4:30 p.m. on July 31, 1995.

Hand-delivered applications will be accepted Monday through Friday prior to and on July 31, 1995 during the hours of 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in the lobby of the Hubert H. Humphrey building located at 200 Independence Avenue, SW., in Washington, DC. When hand-delivering an application, call 690–8794 from the lobby for pick-up. A staff person will be available to receive applications.

An application will be considered as meeting the deadline if it is either: (1) Received at, or hand-delivered to, the mailing address on or before July 31, 1995, or (2) postmarked before midnight five days prior to the deadline date July 31, 1995, and received in time to be considered during the competitive review process (within two weeks of the deadline date).

When mailing application packages, applicants are strongly advised to obtain a legibly dated receipt from a commercial carrier (such as UPS, Federal Express, etc.), or from the U.S. Postal Service as proof of mailing by the deadline date. If there is a question as to when an application was mailed, applicants will be asked to provide proof of mailing by the deadline date. When proof is not provided, an application will not be considered for funding. Private metered postmarks are not acceptable as proof of timely mailing.

Applications which do not meet the July 31, 1995, deadline are considered late applications and will not be considered or reviewed in the current competition. HHS will send a letter to this effect to each late applicant.

HHS reserves the right to extend the deadline for all applications due to acts of God, such as floods, hurricanes or earthquakes; due to acts of war; if there is widespread disruption of the mail; or if HHS determines a deadline extension to be in the best of the Government. However, HHS will not waive or extend the deadline for any applicant unless the deadline is waived or extended for all applicants.

Applications forms. See section entitled ''Components of a Complete Application.'' All of these documents must accompany the application package.

Length of Application. Applications should be brief and concise as possible, but assure successful communication of the applicant's proposal to the reviewers. In no case shall an applicant (excluding the resume appendix and other appropriate attachments) be longer than 25 double-spaced pages; it should neither be unduly elaborate not contain voluminous supporting documentation.

Disposition of Applications.

1. *Approval, disapproval, or deferral.* On the basis of the review of an application, the ASPE will either (a) approve the application in whole, as revised, or in part for such amount of funds and subject to such conditions as are deemed necessary or desirable for the initiation and operation of the data linking project; (b) disapprove the application; or (c) defer action on the application for such reasons as lack of funds or a need for further review.

2. *Notification of disposition.* The ASPE will notify the applicants of the disposition of their application. A signed notification of award will be

issued to notify the applicant of the approved application.

Components of a Complete Application. A complete application consists of the following items in this order:

1. Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form 424, Revised 4–88);
2. Budget Information—Non-construction Programs (Standard Form 424A, Revised 4–88);
3. Assurances—Non-construction Programs (Standard Form 424B, Revised 4–88);
4. Table of Contents;
5. Budget Justification for Section B—Budget Categories;
6. Proof of non-profit status, if appropriate;
7. Copy of the applicant's approved indirect cost rate agreement if necessary;
8. Project Narrative Statement, organized in five sections addressing the following topics:
   (a) Understanding of the Effort,
   (b) Project Approach,
   (c) Staffing Utilization, Staff Background, and Experience,
   (d) Organizational Experience, and
   (e) Budget Narrative;
9. Any appendices/attachments;
10. Certification Regarding Drug-Free Work place;
11. Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and
12. Certification and, if necessary, Disclosure Regarding Lobbying;
13. Supplement to Section II—Key Personnel; and
14. Application for Federal Assistance Checklist.

Dated: May 22, 1995.

David T. Ellwood,

Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

[FR Doc. 95–13220 Filed 5–30–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4151–04–M

Public Health Service

National Toxicology Program; Board of Scientific Counselors' Meeting

Pursuant to Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given of a meeting of the National Toxicology Program (NTP) Board of Scientific Counselors, U. S. Public Health Service, in the Conference Center, Building 101, South Campus, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), 111 Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, on June 29, 1995.

The primary agenda topic will be concerned with the report and recommendations of the *ad hoc* working group of the NTP Board from their review of the criteria for listing substances in the *Biennial Report on Carcinogens* (BRC) (formerly *Annual Report on Carcinogens*) on April 24 and 25, 1995. Specifically, the Board will:

(1) review the report and recommendations of the *ad hoc* working group;

(2) receive public comments on the report; and

(3) develop Board recommendations concerning the selection criteria.

The preliminary agenda topics with approximate times are as follows:

8:30 a.m.–8:45 a.m.—Report of the Director, NTP.

8:45 a.m.–9:15 a.m.—Report of the Director, Environmental Toxicology Program (ETP).

9:15 a.m.–9:45 a.m.—Report of the NTP Workshop on ''Mechanism-Based Toxicology in Cancer Risk Assessment: Implications for Research, Regulation, and Legislation,'' held January 11–13, 1995.

10:00 a.m.–10:20 a.m.—Report on the Meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group to Review Criteria for Listing of Substances in the BRC.

10:20 a.m.–11:00 a.m.—Board Discussion of the Working Group Report.

11:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m.—Public Comments on the Report.

1:15 p.m.–2:15 p.m.—Further Discussion and Development of Recommendations by the Board Concerning the BRC Selection Criteria.

2:15 p.m.–2:25 p.m.—Report on Technical Reports Review Subcommittee Activities.

2:25 p.m.–2:55 p.m.—Chemicals Nominated and Recommended for Study by the Interagency Committee for Chemical Evaluation and Coordination (ICCEC) on December 14, 1994, will be presented for discussion and time will be allowed for public comment. Chemicals evaluated by the ICCEC were (with CAS Nos. in parentheses): (1) Arsenic Trioxide (1327–53–3); (2) Ethidium Bromide (1239–45–8); (3) 5-(Hydroxymethyl)furfural (67–47–0); (4) Isoamyl Acetate (123–92–2); and (5) MX [3-chloro-4-(dichloromethyl) 5-hydroxy-2-(5H)-furanone] (77439–76–0). One chemical previously evaluated was re-reviewed: Hexamethyldisilazane (999–97–3).

3:15 p.m.–3:45 p.m.—Concept Review: *In Vitro* and *In Vivo* Genetic Toxicology Testing.

3:45 p.m.–4:30 p.m.—Alternative Methods—Status and Plans:

—RFA for Research in ''Mechanistically Based Alternative Methods in Toxicology.''

—Proposed Workshop on ''Alternative Test Methods in Toxicology: Validation and Regulatory Acceptance.''

Adjournment

Public Comments Encouraged

The meeting is open to the public, and public input concerning the criteria for listing a substance in the *Biennial Report on Carcinogens* is encouraged. A brief summary of the *ad hoc* working group meeting, including the current and proposed revised criteria, is available on request from the NTP Liaison Office, P.O. Box 12233, MD B3–01, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, phone: (919) 541–0530, FAX: (919) 541–0295. This summary also will be published in the **Federal Register** in late May or early June. Written comments can be submitted to Dr. Larry G. Hart, Executive Secretary. Formal oral comments during the meeting will be limited to five minutes to permit maximum participation. Written comments accompanying oral statements are encouraged. To assure consideration by the Board at the meeting, written comments must be received by June 23, 1995. Registration to attend is not required; however, to ensure adequate seating, we ask that those planning to attend let us know. To register, submit written comments or announce intention to make oral comments, receive information on the agenda, or be put on the mailing list for summary minutes subsequent to the meeting, please contact: Dr. L. G. Hart, P.O. Box 12233, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709; telephone: (919) 541–3971; FAX: (919) 541–0719.

Dated: May 18, 1995.

Kenneth Olden,

Director, National Toxicology Program.

[FR Doc. 95–13284 Filed 5–30–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of Administration

[Docket No. N–95–3922]

Notice of Submission of Proposed Information Collection to OMB

AGENCY: Office of Administration, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below has been submitted to the Office of