Name of SEP: Biological and Physiological Sciences.

Date: August 7, 1996.

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Place: NIH, Rockledge 2, Room 6178, Telephone Conference.

Contact Person: Dr. Nancy Pearson, Scientific Review Administrator, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 6178, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, (301) 435–1047.

Name of SEP: Microbiological and Immunological Sciences.

Date: August 8, 1996.

Time: 12:00 p.m.

Place: NIH, Rockledge 2, Room 4186, Telephone Conference.

Contact Person: Dr. Gerald Liddel, Scientific Review Administrator, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 4186, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, (301) 435–1150.

Name of SEP: Biological and Physiological Sciences.

Date: August 8, 1996.

Time: 3:00 p.m.

Place: NIH, Rockledge 2, Room 4148, Telephone Conference.

Contact Person: Dr. Phil Perkins, Scientific Review Administrator, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 4148, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, (301) 435–1718.

Name of SEP: Biological and Physiological Sciences.

Date: August 22, 1996.

Time: 3:00 p.m.

Place: NIH, Rockledge 2, Room 4148, Telephone Conference.

Contact Person: Dr. Phil Perkins, Scientific Review Administrator, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 4148, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, (301) 435–1718.

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: July 16, 1996.

Margery G. Grubb,

Senior Committee Management Specialist, NIH.

[FR Doc. 96–18735 Filed 7–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

Department of Health and Human Services

Office of Refugee Resettlement

Refugee Resettlement Program: Allocations to States of FY 1996 Funds for Refugee Social Services

AGENCY: Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), ACF, HHS.

ACTION: Final notice of allocations to States of FY 1996 funds for refugee[1] social services.

SUMMARY: This notice establishes the allocations to States of FY 1996 funds for social services under the Refugee Resettlement Program (RRP). This notice reflects the new social service provisions in the final rule published in the Federal Register on June 28, 1995, (60 FR 33584) which became effective October 1, 1995. This notice discontinues the special discretionary funds set-aside for services to former political prisoners from Vietnam.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 24, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Office of Refugee Resettlement, Administration for Children and Families, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., Washington, DC 20447.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Toyo Biddle, Director, Division of Refugee Self-Sufficiency, (202) 401–9250.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice of the proposed social service allocations to States was published in the Federal Register on May 6, 1996, (61 FR 20268). The population estimates that were used in the proposed notice have been adjusted as a result of additional arrival information.

I. Amounts For Allocation

The Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) has available $80,802,000 in FY 1996 refugee social service funds as part of the FY 1996 appropriation for the Department of Health and Human Services (Pub. L. 104–134). We are discontinuing in FY 1996 the special $2,000,000 discretionary funds set-aside for services to former political prisoners from Vietnam. However, ORR expects States to address the special needs of former political prisoners from Vietnam through their regular refugee social service funds as part of the States' 5-year eligible service population.

Of the total of $80,802,000, the Director of ORR is making available to States $68,681,700 (85%) under the allocation formula set out in this notice. These funds are available for the purpose of providing social services to refugees.

Refugee Social Service Funds

The population figures for the social service allocation include refugees, Cuban/Haitian entrants, and Amerasians from Vietnam since these populations may be served through funds addressed in this notice. (A State must, however, have an approved State plan for the Cuban/Haitian Entrant Program or indicate in its refugee program State plan that Cuban/Haitian entrants will be served in order to use funds on behalf of entrants as well as refugees.)

The Director is allocating $68,681,700 to States on the basis of each State's proportion of the national population of refugees who had been in the U.S. 3 years or less as of October 1, 1995 (including a floor amount for States which have small refugee populations).

The use of the 3-year population base in the allocation formula is required by section 412(c)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) which states that the ''funds available for a fiscal year for grants and contracts [for social services] * * * shall be allocated among the States based on the total number of refugees (including children and adults) who arrived in the United States not more than 36 months before the beginning of such fiscal year and who are actually residing in each State (taking into account secondary migration) as of the beginning of the fiscal year.''

As established in the FY 1991 social services notice published in the Federal Register of August 29, 1991, section I, ''Allocation Amounts'' (56 FR 42745), a variable floor amount for States which have small refugee populations is

[1] In addition to persons who meet all requirements of 45 CFR 400.43, ''Requirements for documentation of refugee status,'' eligibility for refugee social services also includes: (1) Cuban and Haitian entrants, under section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96–422); (2) certain Amerasians from Vietnam who are admitted to the U.S. as immigrants under section 584 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988, as included in the FY 1988 Continuing Resolution (Pub. L. No. 100–202); and (3) certain Amerasians from Vietnam, including U.S. citizens, under title II of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Acts, 1989 (Pub. L. 100–461), 1990 (Pub. L. 101–167), and 1991 (Pub. L. 101–513). For convenience, the term ''refugee'' is used in this notice to encompass all such eligible persons unless the specific context indicates otherwise.

Refugees admitted to the U.S. under admissions numbers set aside for private-sector-initiative admissions are not eligible to be served under the social service program (or under other programs supported by Federal refugee funds) during their period of coverage under their sponsoring agency's agreement with the Department of State—usually two years from their date of arrival or until they obtain permanent resident alien status, whichever comes first.

calculated as follows: If the application of the regular allocation formula yields less than $100,000, then—

(1) a base amount of $75,000 is provided for a State with a population of 50 or fewer refugees who have been in the U.S. 3 years or less; and—

(2) for a State with more than 50 refugees who have been in the U.S. 3 years or less: (a) A floor has been calculated consisting of $50,000 plus the regular per capita allocation for refugees above 50 up to a total of $100,000 (in other words, the maximum under the floor formula is $100,000); (b) if this calculation has yielded less than $75,000, a base amount of $75,000 is provided for the State.

ORR has consistently supported floors for small States in order to provide sufficient funds to carry out a minimum service program. Given the range in numbers of refugees in the small States, we have concluded that a variable floor, as established in the FY 1991 notice, will be more reflective of needs than previous across-the-board floors.

The $12,120,300 in remaining social service funds (15% of the total funds available) will be used by ORR on a discretionary basis to provide funds for individual projects intended to contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of the refugee resettlement program. Grant announcements on discretionary initiatives have been issued separately.

Population To Be Served

Although the allocation formula is based on the 3-year refugee population, in accordance with the current requirements of 45 CFR Part 400 Subpart I—Refugee Social Services, States are not required to limit social service programs to refugees who have been in the U.S. only 3 years. However, effective October 1, 1995, under new regulations published in the Federal Register on June 28, 1995, (60 FR 33584), States may not provide services funded by this notice, except for referral and interpreter services, to refugees who have been in the United States for more than 60 months (5 years). States may, however, continue to provide employability services through September 30, 1996, or until the services are completed, whichever occurs first, to refugees who have been in the U.S. for more than 60 months, who were receiving employability services, as defined in § 400.154, as of September 30, 1995, as part of an employability plan.

In accordance with § 400.147, States are required to provide services to refugees in the following order of priority, except in certain individual extreme circumstances: (a) All newly arriving refugees during their first year in the U.S., who apply for services; (b) refugees who are receiving cash assistance; (c) unemployed refugees who are not receiving cash assistance; and (d) employed refugees in need of services to retain employment or to attain economic independence.

ORR funds may not be used to provide services to United States citizens, since they are not covered under the authorizing legislation, with the following exceptions: (1) Under current regulations at 45 CFR 400.208, services may be provided to a U.S.-born minor child in a family in which both parents are refugees or, if only one parent is present, in which that parent is a refugee; and (2) under the FY 1989 Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act (Pub. L. 100–461), services may be provided to an Amerasian from Vietnam who is a U.S. citizen and who enters the U.S. after October 1, 1988.

Service Priorities

Refugee social service funding should be used to assist refugee families to achieve economic independence. To this end, States are required to ensure that a coherent family self-sufficiency plan is developed for each eligible family that addresses the family's needs from time of arrival until attainment of economic independence. (See §§ 400.79 and 400.156(g).) Each family self-sufficiency plan should address a family's needs for both employment-related services and other needed social services. The family self-sufficiency plan must include: (1) A determination of the income level a family would have to earn to exceed its cash grant and move into self-support without suffering a monetary penalty; (2) a strategy and timetable for obtaining that level of family income through the placement in employment of sufficient numbers of employable family members at sufficient wage levels; and (3) employability plans for every employable member of the family.

Reflecting section 412(a)(1)(A)(iv) of the INA, and in keeping with § 400.145, States must ensure that women have the same opportunities as men to participate in all services funded under this notice, including job placement services. In addition, services must be provided to the maximum extent feasible in a manner that includes the use of bilingual/bicultural women on service agency staffs to ensure adequate service access by refugee women. The Director also strongly encourages the inclusion of refugee women in management and board positions in agencies that serve refugees. In order to facilitate refugee self-support, the Director also expects States to implement strategies which address simultaneously the employment potential of both male and female wage earners in a family unit, particularly in the case of large families. States are expected to make every effort to assure the availability of day care services for children in order to allow women with children the opportunity to participate in employment services or to accept or retain employment. To accomplish this, day care may be treated as a priority employment-related service under the refugee social services program. Refugees who are participating in employment services or have accepted employment are eligible for day care services for children. For an employed refugee, day care funded by refugee social service dollars should be limited to one year after the refugee becomes employed. States are expected to use day care funding from other publicly funded mainstream programs as a prior resource and are expected to work with service providers to assure maximum access to other publicly funded resources for day care.

In accordance with § 400.146 in the new regulations, social service funds must be used primarily for employability services designed to enable refugees to obtain jobs within one year of becoming enrolled in services in order to achieve economic self-sufficiency as soon as possible. Social services may continue to be provided after a refugee has entered a job to help the refugee retain employment or move to a better job. Social service funds may not be used for long-term training programs such as vocational training that last for more than a year or educational programs that are not intended to lead to employment within a year.

In accordance with § 400.156, refugee social services must be provided, to the maximum extent feasible, in a manner that is culturally and linguistically compatible with a refugee's language and cultural background. In light of the increasingly diverse population of refugees who are resettling in this country, refugee service agencies will need to develop practical ways of providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to a changing ethnic population.

Services funded under this notice must be refugee-specific services which are designed specifically to meet refugee needs and are in keeping with the rules and objectives of the refugee program. Vocational or job skills training, on-the-job training, or English language

training, however, need not be refugee-specific.

English language training must be provided in a concurrent, rather than sequential, time period with employment or with other employment-related activities.

When planning State refugee services, States must take into account the reception and placement (R & P) services provided by local resettlement agencies in order to utilize these resources in the overall program design and to ensure the provision of seamless, coordinated services to refugees that are not duplicative.

In order to provide culturally and linguistically compatible services in as cost-efficient a manner as possible in a time of limited resources, ORR encourages States and counties to promote and give special consideration to the provision of refugee social services through coalitions of refugee service organizations, such as coalitions of mutual assistance associations (MAAs), voluntary resettlement agencies, or a variety of service providers. ORR believes it is essential for refugee-serving organizations to form close partnerships in the provision of services to refugees in order to be able to respond adequately to a changing refugee picture. Coalition-building and consolidation of providers is particularly important in communities with multiple service providers in order to ensure better coordination of services and maximum use of funding for services by minimizing the funds used for multiple administrative overhead costs.

States should also expect to use funds available under this notice to pay for social services which are provided to refugees who participate in alternative projects. Section 412(e)(7)(A) of the INA provides that:

> The Secretary [of HHS] shall develop and implement alternative projects for refugees who have been in the United States less than thirty-six months, under which refugees are provided interim support, medical services, support [social] services, and case management, as needed, in a manner that encourages self-sufficiency, reduces welfare dependency, and fosters greater coordination among the resettlement agencies and service providers.

This provision is generally known as the Wilson/Fish Amendment. The Department has already issued a separate notice in the Federal Register with respect to applications for such projects (60 FR 15766, March 27, 1995). The notice on alternative projects does not contain provisions for the allocation of additional social service funds beyond the amounts established in this notice. Therefore a State which may wish to consider carrying out such a project should take note of this in planning its use of social service funds being allocated under the present notice.

Funding to MAAs

ORR no longer provides set-aside funds to refugee mutual assistance associations as a separate component under the social service notice; instead we have folded these funds into the social service formula allocation to States. Elimination of the MAA set-aside, however, does not represent any reduction in ORR's commitment to MAAs as important participants in refugee resettlement. ORR believes that the continued and/or increased utilization of qualified refugee mutual assistance associations in the delivery of social services helps to ensure the provision of culturally and linguistically appropriate services as well as increasing the effectiveness of the overall service system. Therefore, ORR expects States to use MAAs as service providers to the maximum extent possible. ORR strongly encourages States when contracting for services, including employment services, to give consideration to the special strengths of MAAs, whenever contract bidders are otherwise equally qualified, provided that the MAA has the capability to deliver services in a manner that is culturally and linguistically compatible with the background of the target population to be served. ORR also strongly encourages MAAs to ensure that their management and board composition reflect the major target populations to be served. ORR expects States to continue to assist MAAs in seeking other public and/or private funds for the provision of services to refugee clients.

States may use a portion of their social service grant, either through contracts or through the use of State/county staff, to provide technical assistance and organizational training to strengthen the capability of MAAs to provide employment services, particularly in States where MAA capability is weak or undeveloped.

ORR defines MAAs as organizations with the following qualifications:

a. The organization is legally incorporated as a nonprofit organization; and

b. Not less than 51% of the composition of the Board of Directors or governing board of the mutual assistance association is comprised of refugees or former refugees, including both refugee men and women.

II. Discussion of Comments Received

We received two letters of comment in response to the notice of proposed FY 1996 allocations to States for refugee social services. The comments are summarized below and are followed in each case by the Department's response.

Comment: One commenter opposed the use of 15 percent of social service funds for discretionary grants. The commenter recommended that these funds instead be distributed by formula to impacted areas with the requirement that each area receiving funds do an ''initiative'' type project that could be expanded, if successful, to the larger population.

Response: We continue to believe that it is necessary to maintain a portion of social service funds for discretionary use. The discretionary grant process allows greater flexibility than does the formula allocation process for carrying out national initiatives and special projects that respond to changing needs and circumstances in the refugee program.

Comment: One commenter objected to the allotment of a floor amount of social service funds to States with small refugee populations. In particular, the commenter suggested that a floor for States with less than 1,000 refugees should not be included in the allocation.

Response: We continue to believe that a minimum allocation for social services is necessary to cover basic costs which a State incurs in providing services, regardless of the number of refugees to be served. Therefore, we view the establishment of a floor as a reasonable approach to allocating funds to States with small refugee populations, where the use of the formula alone would yield too small an amount to be practical.

Comment: One commenter objected to unlimited State administrative costs and recommended that State administrative costs be capped at 5 percent of the grant amount.

Response: Current regulations at 45 CFR 400.206 allow reimbursement to States for 100 percent of their administrative costs. Therefore, imposing an administrative cap would require a regulatory change and could not be accomplished through a notice. All costs charged by States to social services grants for administration must meet Federal grant requirements and must be reasonable, necessary, and identifiable. Further, there is no statutory limitation on the amount of social services funds that can be used by States for administrative costs. We, therefore, have no plans to impose a cap on what a State may charge for

administrative costs, choosing instead to allow States to make that determination.

Comment: One commenter suggested that reductions in social services funding in some States may impact performance outcomes in FY 1996. The commenter further suggested that surpassing previous years' performance may become increasingly more difficult for States that receive less funds.

Response: States that receive reduced funding in comparison to previous years are States that have also experienced reduced numbers of refugee arrivals over the past three years. The performance measures developed by ORR, in conjunction with States, take into consideration the impact of reduced arrivals, and reduced funding, on performance outcomes by looking not only at actual outcome figures but also at outcomes in the context of total caseloads and as percentages of caseloads. We believe, therefore, that reduced funding should not impact the ability of States to continue to improve their performance outcomes since changing caseloads are taken into consideration in setting goals and assessing performance.

Comment: One commenter suggested that ORR should support a statutory change to provide that social services funds be allocated based on the five-year refugee population rather than the three-year population that is currently used. The commenter suggested that such a change would more equitably reflect State and local workloads.

Response: We do not believe there is a compelling enough reason to seek a statutory change that would change the social service allocation method from a three-year population base to a five-year population base. An argument can be made that basing social service allocations on a three-year population, by reflecting the pattern of more recent refugee arrivals, ensures that funds are allocated to those States most in need of additional funds in meeting the needs of new arrivals.

Comment: One commenter suggested that ORR is asking for an inappropriate amount of detail in specifying what the family self-sufficiency plan must include. The commenter suggested that the information to be collected would not necessarily enable the refugee to obtain a job earlier or for a longer period of time. The commenter further suggested that the exercise of developing family self-sufficiency plans would require more paperwork and staff time and would result in increased administrative costs.

Response: We believe that social services providers should focus on the family, not on the individual refugee, as the unit of intervention. The purpose of the family self-sufficiency plan is to ensure that the refugee family as a whole is enabled to become self-supporting as quickly as possible. The plan, as described in the notice, ensures that providers will make a determination of the total amount of income that a family would have to earn to become self-sufficient. It also ensures that a strategy and timetable will be developed for obtaining the necessary level of income to move the family off assistance. Although the additional information required for a family self-sufficiency plan may not result in an individual refugee obtaining a job earlier or for a longer period of time, there is evidence that the development of such plans result in earlier family self-sufficiency through the attainment of jobs for one or more wage-earners at self-supporting wages. We believe that the long-term benefits of this approach to family self-sufficiency will outweigh any additional paperwork or staff time that may be required. Further, we believe that, by increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the refugee program in promoting family self-sufficiency, this approach will result in decreased, rather than increased, overall, long-term administrative costs.

III. Allocation Formula

Of the funds available for FY 1996 for social services, $68,681,700 is allocated to States in accordance with the formula specified below. A State's allowable allocation is calculated as follows:

1. The total amount of funds determined by the Director to be available for this purpose; divided by—

2. The total number of refugees and Cuban/Haitian entrants who arrived in the United States not more than 3 years prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which the funds are appropriated and the number of Amerasians from Vietnam eligible for refugee social services, as shown by the ORR Refugee Data System. The resulting per capita amount will be multiplied by—

3. The number of persons in item 2, above, in the State as of October 1, 1995, adjusted for estimated secondary migration.

The calculation above yields the formula allocation for each State. Minimum allocations for small States are taken into account.

IV. Basis of Population Estimates

The population estimates for the allocation of funds in FY 1996 are based on data on refugee arrivals from the ORR Refugee Data System, adjusted as of October 1, 1995, for estimated secondary migration. The data base includes refugees of all nationalities, Amerasians from Vietnam, and Cuban and Haitian entrants.

For fiscal year 1996, ORR's formula allocations for the States for social services are based on the numbers of refugees and Amerasians who arrived, and on the numbers of entrants who arrived or were resettled, during the preceding three fiscal years: 1993, 1994, and 1995, based on final arrival data by State. Therefore, estimates have been developed of the numbers of refugees and entrants with arrival or resettlement dates between October 1, 1992, and September 30, 1995, who are thought to be living in each State as of October 1, 1995. Refugees admitted under the Federal Government's private-sector initiative are not included, since their assistance and services are to be provided by the private sponsoring organizations under an agreement with the Department of State.

The estimates of secondary migration were based on data submitted by all participating States on Form ORR–11 on secondary migrants who have resided in the U.S. for 36 months or less, as of September 30, 1995. The total migration reported by each State was summed, yielding in- and out-migration figures and a net migration figure for each State. The net migration figure was applied to the State's total arrival figure, resulting in a revised population estimate.

Estimates were developed separately for refugees and entrants and then combined into a total estimated 3-year refugee/entrant population for each State. Eligible Amerasians are included in the refugee figures.

At this time, ORR entrant arrival data do not include Cuban parolees who came to the U.S. directly from Havana in FY 1995 under the U.S. Bilateral Agreement with Cuba. Reliable data on these parolees are difficult to obtain since these parolees are not resettled through sponsoring agencies. One State, the State of Florida, was able to provide appropriate documentation to ORR regarding the number of Havana parolee arrivals to that State. We have adjusted the 3-year population to include Havana parolees to that State based on the data it submitted. For those States that were not able to submit documentation on Havana parolee arrivals, we have decided, in the absence of actual data, to credit each State that received entrant arrivals during the 3-year period from FY 1993–FY 1995 with a prorated share of the parolees who came to the U.S. directly from Havana in FY 1995. We believe it is a reasonable proxy to base the proration on the percentage of the total 3-year entrant population that each county received. The allocations in this

notice reflect these additional parolee numbers.

Table 1, below, shows the estimated 3-year populations, as of October 1, 1995, of refugees (col. 1), entrants, including Havana parolees (col. 2); total refugee/entrant population, (col. 3); the formula amounts which the population estimates yield (col. 4); and the allocation amounts after allowing for the minimum amounts (col. 5).

V. Allocation Amounts

Funding subsequent to the publication of this notice will be contingent upon the submittal and approval of a State annual services plan that is developed on the basis of a local consultative process, as required by § 400.11(b)(2) in the ORR regulations. The following amounts are allocated for refugee social services in FY 1996:

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED 3-YEAR REFUGEE/ENTRANT POPULATIONS OF STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE REFUGEE PROGRAM AND SOCIAL SERVICE FORMULA AMOUNTS AND ALLOCATIONS FOR FY 1996

State	Refugees[1] (1)	Entrants[1] (2)	Total population (3)	Formula amount (4)	Allocation (5)
Alabama	618	79	697	$124,525	$124,525
Alaska[2]	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	3,574	520	4,094	731,428	731,428
Arkansas	317	6	323	57,707	98,774
California	78,043	1,194	79,237	14,156,375	14,156,375
Colorado	3,808	15	3,823	683,012	683,012
Connecticut	2,903	269	3,172	566,705	566,705
Delaware	89	6	95	16,973	75,000
Dist. of Columbia	1,746	12	1,758	314,082	314,082
Florida	13,826	41,546	55,372	9,892,687	9,892,687
Georgia	9,811	241	10,052	1,795,877	1,795,877
Hawaii	758	0	758	135,423	135,423
Idaho	1,090	5	1,095	195,631	195,631
Illinois	12,642	336	12,978	2,318,632	2,318,632
Indiana	1,140	15	1,155	206,351	206,351
Iowa	3,461	5	3,466	619,231	619,231
Kansas	2,112	14	2,126	379,828	379,828
Kentucky[4]	2,301	208	2,509	448,255	448,255
Louisiana	2,030	286	2,316	413,773	413,773
Maine	724	1	725	129,528	129,528
Maryland	6,349	177	6,526	1,165,926	1,165,926
Massachusetts	10,009	205	10,214	1,824,819	1,824,819
Michigan	7,725	235	7,960	1,422,123	1,422,123
Minnesota	9,846	25	9,871	1,763,540	1,763,540
Mississippi	111	41	152	27,156	75,000
Missouri	4,998	31	5,029	898,474	898,474
Montana	182	0	182	32,516	75,000
Nebraska	1,847	7	1,854	331,233	331,233
Nevada[4]	769	935	1,704	304,434	304,434
New Hampshire	686	1	687	122,738	122,738
New Jersey	6,371	1,481	7,852	1,402,828	1,402,828
New Mexico	948	1,160	2,108	376,612	376,612
New York	60,179	1,409	61,588	11,003,229	11,003,229
North Carolina	3,221	26	3,247	580,105	580,105
North Dakota	1,044	5	1,049	187,413	187,413
Ohio	5,094	25	5,119	914,554	914,554
Oklahoma	1,351	16	1,367	244,226	244,226
Oregon	5,149	343	5,492	981,193	981,193
Pennslyvania	9,759	175	9,934	1,774,795	1,774,795
Rhode Island	656	4	660	117,915	117,915
South Carolina	503	2	505	90,223	100,000
South Dakota	658	0	658	117,557	117,557
Tennessee	3,408	81	3,489	623,340	623,340
Texas	15,889	1,170	17,059	3,047,738	3,047,738
Utah	1,774	0	1,774	316,940	316,940
Vermont	720	0	720	128,634	128,634
Virginia	5,905	220	6,125	1,094,284	1,094,284
Washington	119,081	27	19,108	3,413,809	3,413,809
West Virginia	27	1	28	5,002	75,000
Wisconsin	5,095	16	5,111	913,124	913,124
Wyoming[2]	0	0	0	0	0
Total	330,347	52,576	382,923	68,412,503	68,681,700

[1] Includes 8240 Havana Parolees (HP's) to Florida and Havana parolees credited to States other than Florida based on States' proportion of the 3-year entrant population in the U.S.
[2] Alaska and Wyoming on longer participate in the Refugee Program.
[3] A portion of the California allocation is expected to be awarded to continue a Wilson/Fish project in San Diego.
[4] The allocation for Kentucky and Nevada is expected to be awarded to continue a Wilson/Fish project.

VI. Paperwork Reduction Act

This notice does not create any reporting or recordkeeping requirements requiring OMB clearance.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 93.566 Refugee Assistance—State Administered Programs)

Dated: July 18, 1996.

Lavinia Limon,

Director, Office of Refugee Resettlement.

[FR Doc. 96–18829 Filed 7–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

[Docket No. FR–4086–N–11]

Notice of Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

DATES: *Comments due*: September 23, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Marianne C. DeConti, Reports Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Room 10218, Washington, DC 20410.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard S. Allan, 202–708–0370 (this is not a toll-free number) for copies of the proposed forms and other available documents.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department will submit the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended).

The Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affecting agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: Record of Employee Interview.

OMB Control Number, if applicable: 2510–0009.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use: This information is utilized by HUD and local agency officials administering HUD-assisted programs to record interviews of construction workers for the purpose of establishing the degree of accuracy of contractor payroll records and the nature and extent of violations, if any. The information may be used as evidence in proceedings against the contractor in labor standards investigations.

Agency form numbers, if applicable: HUD–11.

Members of affected public: Individuals or Households, State, Local, or Tribal Government, and the Federal Government.

Estimation of the total numbers of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response: Reporting (20,000 respondents × 1 time per year × 20 minutes per respondent=5,000 burden hours) + Recordkeeping (1,000 respondents × 1 time per year × 5 hours=5,000 burden hours)=10,000 total burden hours.

Status of the proposed information collection: Reinstatement, no changes.

Authority: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended.

Dated: July 10, 1996.

Richard S. Allan.

Deputy Assistant to the Secretary for Labor Relations.

[FR Doc. 96–18814 Filed 7–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–32–M

[Docket No. FR–4086–N–07]

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development; Notice of Proposed Information Collection for Public Comment

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

DATES: Comments due September 23, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Reports Liaison Officer, Shelia E. Jones, Department of Housing & Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Room 7230, Washington, DC 20410.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vernessa Whitfield, 202/708–2035 (this is not a toll-free number) for copies of the proposed forms and other available documents:

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department will submit the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended).

The Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected, and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: Youthbuild Program.