FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Notice of Proposals to Engage in Permissible Nonbanking Activities or to Acquire Companies that are Engaged in Permissible Nonbanking Activities

The companies listed in this notice have given notice under section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843) (BHC Act) and Regulation Y, (12 CFR Part 225) to engage *de novo*, or to acquire or control voting securities or assets of a company that engages either directly or through a subsidiary or other company, in a nonbanking activity that is listed in § 225.28 of Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.28) or that the Board has determined by Order to be closely related to banking and permissible for bank holding companies. Unless otherwise noted, these activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Each notice is available for inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the notice has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the question whether the proposal complies with the standards of section 4 of the BHC Act.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding the applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than July 3, 1997.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of New York (Betsy Buttrill White, Senior Vice President) 33 Liberty Street, New York, New York 10045-0001:

1. Bankers Trust New York Corporation, New York, New York (''BTNY''); to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Alex Brown Inc., Baltimore, Maryland, and thereby engage in underwriting and dealing in, to a limited extent, all types of debt and equity securities other than interests in open end investment companies, *See J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., The Chase Manhattan Corp., Bankers Trust New York Corp., Citicorp and Security Pacific Corp.*, 75 Fed. Res. Bull. 192 (1989); in making, acquiring, brokering and servicing loans or other extensions of credit for their own account and the account of others, pursuant to § 225.28(b)(1) of the Board's Regulation Y; in performing functions or activities that may be performed by a trust company (including activities of a fiduciary, agency or custodial nature), pursuant to § 225.28(b)(5) of the Board's Regulation Y; in acting as investment or financial advisor, pursuant to § 225.28(b)(6) of the Board's Regulation Y; in providing securities brokerage services (including securities clearing and securities execution services on an exchange), alone and in combination with investment advisory services, and incidental activities (including related securities credit activities and custodial services), pursuant to § 225.28(b)(7) of the Board's Regulation Y; in buying and selling in the secondary market all types of securities on the order of customers as a riskless principal to the extent of engaging in a transaction in which the company, after receiving an order to buy (or sell) a security from a customer, purchases (or sells) the security for its own account to offset a contemporaneous sale to (or purchase from) the customer, pursuant to § 225.28(b)(7) of the Board's Regulation Y; in acting as agent for the private placement of securities in accordance with the requirements of the Securities Act of 1933 and the rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission, pursuant to § 225.28(b)(7) of the Board's Regulation Y; in underwriting and dealing in obligations of the United States, general obligations of states and their political subdivisions, and other obligations that state member banks of the Federal Reserve System may be authorized to underwrite and deal in under 12 U.S.C. 24 and 335, pursuant to § 225.28(b)(8) of the Board's Regulation Y; and in providing administrative and other services to investment companies, including open-end investment companies (''mutual funds''). *See Barclays PLC*, 82 Fed. Res. Bull. 158 (1996); *Bank of Ireland*, 82 Fed. Res. Bull. 1129 (1996). BTNY would engage in these activities in accordance with the limitations and conditions previously established by the Board by regulation or order, with certain exceptions relating to the proposed provision of advisory and administrative services to mutual funds that are discussed in the notice. BTNY also intends to acquire certain offshore subsidiaries, companies engaged in providing services to other Alex Brown affiliates, and proprietary investments currently owned by Alex Brown.

In order to approve the proposal, the Board must determine that the proposed activities to be conducted by BTNY ''Can reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices.'' 12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8). BTNY believes that the proposal would produce public benefits that outweigh any potential adverse effects. In particular, BTNY maintains that the proposal would not materially reduce competition in the relevant markets and would enable BTNY to offer its customer a broader range of products. BTNY also maintains that its proposal would not result in any adverse effects.

In publishing the proposal for comment, the Board does not take a position on issues raised by the proposal. Notice of the proposal is published solely to seek the views of interested persons on the issues presented by the notice and does not represent a determination by the Board that the proposal meets, or is likely to meet, the standards of the BHC Act. Any request for a hearing on this notice must, as required by § 262.3(e) of the Board's Rules of Procedure (12 CFR 262.3(e)), be accompanied by a statement of the reasons why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by the approval of the proposal.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, June 17, 1997.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 97–16206 Filed 6–17–97; 12:38 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; Supporting State Efforts to Link Administrative Data Systems for the Purpose of Studying the Effects of Welfare Reform on Other State and Federal Public Assistance Programs

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

ACTION: Request for grant applications from states to link their administrative program data for the purposes of studying the effects of the newly implemented Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program on recipients and on other state and federal governmental assistance programs.

SUMMARY: The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) announces the availability of funds and invites applications for data linking projects that will allow for improved program management,

monitoring, and research and evaluation activities. The primary purpose of this grant is to provide states with funding that will enable them to link administrative program data from TANF and related State welfare programs with administrative data from at least one other source. The resulting data set can then be used to support research into the effects of TANF on recipients and other government programs. While efforts may be targeted in any area where there is potential interaction between TANF and other government programs, ASPE has identified six specific areas of policy interest. These areas are outlined in section II, Topics of Priority Interest.

CLOSING DATE: The closing date for submitting applications under this announcement is August 18, 1997.

FOR APPLICATION KITS OR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Administrative Officer, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services, 200 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 405F, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Washington, DC 20201, Phone (202) 401–6639.

Part I. Background and Purpose

A. Background

On August 22, 1996, President Clinton signed into law the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996. This law terminated the 61 year-old Aid to Families with Dependent Children program and several related, smaller programs. In its place, the PRWORA established a federal block grant, which gives states great flexibility to develop their own programs and strategies for providing assistance to the poor. Over time, state programs targeted toward the poor are likely to diverge in the new block grant environment. Over the coming years, it will become increasingly important to understand the effects of these changes on recipients, caseloads, and state and federal budgets, in order to assess the need for and scope of future state and federal welfare policy. It will also be important to understand the ways in which the varying TANF programs affect other state and federal programs targeted toward the poor. For example, do a state's changes to its welfare programs improve the access and utilization of medical care among poor children? Does a state's TANF program result in more children being abused, neglected, and placed in the homes of relatives, thereby increasing the burden on the child welfare system? Are new state programs more effective at targeting victims of domestic violence, and offering services and supports for victims who are so identified?

State administrative program data offer a potentially rich source of information on the welfare population. They can therefore be used to answer many of the questions surrounding the effects of the new welfare law. Several states have been linking their administrative program data from a variety of anti-poverty programs for many years, while other states have begun more recently. These databases have provided valuable insight into the characteristics of people served by assistance programs, how program participation varies across different groups of individuals, and how individuals access and utilize multiple services over time. ASPE believes that these databases will prove valuable in analyzing the collateral effects that TANF may have on recipients and on other state and federal programs.

B. Purpose

Given that linked administrative program data have a tremendous potential for assessing the impact of TANF on recipients and other programs, the primary purpose of this grant is to provide states with the necessary funding to link administrative program data from the TANF program with administrative data from at least one other source in order to address at least one policy relevant topic. The resulting data set can then be used by the state to examine the interactions between TANF and other governmental programs. For states that do not currently have a database which contains linked program data, this grant will provide the seed money and impetus for its creation. For states which do have such a database, this funding can enable the state to add administrative data from programs that are not currently represented in the database. While the grant only requires TANF data to be linked with data from one other program, preference will be given to projects which would link data from multiple programs, as such projects would likely provide a greater understanding of how TANF interacts with multiple programs.

Applicants should also consider the time-frame of the information to be included in the database. All projects must include case-level information collected under the new law, which was signed in August of 1996 (states are required to convert to their TANF plans by July 1, 1997). However, preference will be given to those projects which include historical data, so that comparisons can be drawn between prior state AFDC programs—and their relationship to other assistance programs—and new TANF programs.

Note that while a completed research product is not required under this grant, eligible proposals must include a detailed research agenda applicable to the resulting data. This must include the names of qualified researchers who have expressed interest in analyzing the data set. Letters of support from interested researchers and their respective institutions are also strongly encouraged.

C. Eligible Applicants and Funding

We are specifically seeking proposals from state agencies which operate either a TANF program or another state or federal assistance program targeted toward the poor. Counties with a total population of at least 500,000 which operate a county-based welfare system may also apply. Applicants must also have and present proof of a state-wide (or where appropriate, county-wide) database that links micro-level administrative program data from at least two programs serving low-income children and families. If an applicant does not currently have such a database, then the applicant must present proof that such a database will be operational and maintained subsequent to the completion of this project.

Approximately $400,000 is available with funds appropriated for fiscal year 1997. It is expected that approximately 4 awards at an average of $100,000 for 12 months will be awarded. More projects may be funded if additional funding becomes available in fiscal year 1998.

Part II. Topics of Priority Interest

These grants are designed to support state efforts to improve their data infrastructure so that they can better assess the impacts of welfare reform on other state and federal programs, as well as on recipients. There are, therefore, no specific limitations as to the topical areas that applicants may apply to explore with linked administrative data. The following section contains six areas of particular interest that ASPE has identified as relevant in the context of the new welfare law. While each of the topical areas present a range of issues, the possible research questions are in no way meant to be exhaustive. If prospective applicants have additional questions which they feel are relevant within the context of welfare reform and its effect on other assistance programs—for example, the use of administrative data to assess program use for children who have lost SSI benefits—they are

encouraged to raise them in their proposal.

ASPE also understands that there is a great degree of variation in the amount and scope of administrative program data that states collect. It is therefore highly unlikely that every state would have administrative data related to all of the issues and questions raised in the following section. These issues are only meant as a guide to assist prospective applicants in framing the scope of data to be linked under this grant. Additionally, projects are not limited solely to administrative data. Where appropriate and feasible, applicants may choose to link their administrative data with either survey data or other available data.

I. Supporting Services in the Transition From Welfare to Work

The new legislation establishes a five year time limit for the receipt of federal TANF assistance, and a requirement that all able-bodied caretaker recipients enroll in a work or work-training program after two cumulative years of aid. This increased emphasis on work raises questions as to whether states can provide sufficient services to support the transition from welfare to work. Of specific concern are assistance programs other than TANF, such as Medicaid and Food Stamps, which recipients can use while transitioning between welfare and work. The accessibility and affordability of quality child care are also important determinants of the ability to leave welfare permanently.

Medicaid and Food Stamps

For TANF recipients who leave welfare, either for work or as the result of a sanction or time limit, Medicaid and Food Stamps are likely to assume even greater importance as transitional support mechanisms. Both programs offer forms of assistance after eligibility for TANF has expired. By linking individual level case data from both Medicaid and Food Stamps, it may be possible to examine how TANF recipients combine assistance from multiple programs, and how the combination of benefits from these programs affects exits from welfare and/or sustained financial independence.

Analysis of linked administrative data may also contribute to our understanding of how welfare reform affects participation in both the Medicaid and Food Stamps programs. If states make changes in Medicaid eligibility, for example, how do these changes affect program enrollment, participation patterns, and service utilization? Additionally, many states are considering welfare diversion programs, which would provide up-front cash assistance, in the hopes that a one-time cash payment may eliminate the need for on-going TANF assistance. Administrative data may also support analysis of the relationship between diversion programs and participation in Medicaid and Food Stamps.

Child Care

The provision of child care is also a critical support service of any state TANF program. Just as with work programs, the new legislation gives states considerably more latitude in how they provide and fund child care. There are several groups of families that may be affected by child care: current welfare recipients enrolled in work programs, former recipients who are transitioning from welfare to work, and families who are at-risk of entering welfare. There are several important questions and concerns about the provision of child care for all of these groups.

- *Basic types of care arrangements:* To what extent is child care available for people required to work and what are the most common arrangements? What is the quality of each of these arrangements? How do the patterns of usage vary among recipients enrolled in work programs and former recipients no longer receiving welfare services? What are the subsidy rates available for each group? To what extent are eligible recipients taking advantage of services?
- *Welfare exits and child care:* What is the effect of welfare exits on child care? How do child care arrangements change once people leave welfare, either via work or because they have been removed from welfare due to sanctions or time limits? If child care funding is limited for families transitioning off of welfare, where do the children receive services, and what are the budgetary implications of providing these services?

Child Support

While cooperation with child support was a requirement under AFDC, changes under TANF both decrease and increase child support's importance to low income families. In states that choose to eliminate the $50 disregard, payment of child support becomes irrelevant to the income of families receiving cash TANF payments. This change could decrease the willingness of both resident and non-resident parents to cooperate with the child support system, even though the requirements for cooperation with the program for TANF and Food Stamp program recipients have increased However, for families reaching the TANF time-limits or trying to minimize the receipt of TANF cash payments, child support can be an important supplement to low-wage or part-time employment and in some cases may make it possible for families to bridge short periods of unemployment without resorting to TANF cash payments. It is important to understand how these changes in child support policy affect the behavior of both resident and non-resident parents in cooperating with child support, in viewing the fairness of work activity which may require recipients to work off TANF benefits already recouped through child support payments, in using child support as an income supplement to low wages, and in the non-resident parent's provision of financial and non-financial support for his family.

II. Relationships Between TANF and the Child Welfare System

It is possible that welfare reform will create additional financial and social stress for many families, particularly those of long term welfare recipients. Among the possible manifestations of such stress, including the curtailing of welfare as an income source for some household heads, are child neglect and abuse and the short-or long-term dissolution of some particularly fragile families. Transfer of custody of some children to grandparents or other relatives may also become a more attractive option for parents whose benefits are sanctioned or who become ineligible for assistance because of time limits or other restrictions.

Are changes in child living arrangements correlated with the imposition of time limits, sanctions, and work requirements? For instance, are increasing numbers/proportions of children cared for by relatives other than parents (either as assistance units headed by relatives or as child-only assistance units)? Or are increasing numbers/proportions of children neglected or abused, or entering foster care, following the elimination of financial assistance to a family? Linkages between welfare program administrative data and child welfare data systems may assist in the investigation of such questions.

III. Impact of Teen Pregnancy and the Provision of Services to Teen Parents

The PRWORA requires that any minor teen parent who is receiving federally funded TANF services must live at home or in an adult supervised setting unless there is a good cause exemption. It will be important to determine how this affects both the population of teens who are currently receiving welfare

services, and also those teens who will become pregnant and may require TANF services subsequent to a state's implementation of TANF. For example, what are the positive and negative consequences of this provision? Are more teens living in supervised settings and completing high school? Are teens losing welfare benefits or failing to qualify for them because of non-compliance with this provision? If so, then how many of these teens, and how many of their children, will instead require services through other social service programs, such as the child welfare system?

Additionally, since potential harm to the teen or her child would qualify as a good cause exemption, there may be an increase in the reporting of child abuse and neglect. Linking TANF data with information from both child abuse and neglect reporting systems and from child welfare systems will help clarify the effects of TANF on teen parents receiving TANF services.

The new law also permits states to use TANF funds for family planning and abstinence education. Through linking TANF data with information from the providers of these services, a state could begin to examine how these funds are being used and how adequately they are being targeted toward TANF families. Additionally, if TANF data are linked with Medicaid or Vital Statistics data, then a state could assess how effective these services are with respect to decreasing teen pregnancies among welfare recipients.

IV. Impact of TANF on Out-Of-Wedlock Births and Fertility Patterns

One of the four principal goals of the TANF program is to ''prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies.'' This emphasis is coupled with the law's illegitimacy bonus, which awards funds to up to five states that are most successful in reducing out-of-wedlock births among women of all ages. States are designing and implementing an array of programs aimed at reducing the number of births to unmarried mothers. It will be important to assess the impacts of these programs, both on the overall population, and more specifically on those individuals receiving TANF assistance. Some specific questions are as follows:

- Do programs aimed at reducing out-of-wedlock birth rates among the welfare population, such as family cap policies, actually affect subsequent births on welfare mothers? If so, what is the direction and magnitude of the change? Or do these policies encourage welfare recipients to place children in different living situations (relatives, for example) where they are eligible for assistance either through the foster care system or as a separate AFDC/TANF unit? Additionally, do these policies have any effect on a state's abortion rate? If so, what are the direction and magnitude of the effect?
- Does a stronger focus on work requirements and personal responsibility have an impact on fertility? Specifically, what are the fertility patterns of welfare recipients required to work and how do they change over time? How do the changes in fertility patterns affect caseloads and costs in other programs, such as Medicaid and the child welfare system?
- Given time limits and the increased emphasis on work, it is likely that exits from welfare will increase significantly in the coming years. It will be important to study how the fertility patterns of people who lose benefits due to sanctions, time limits, and/or other prohibitions differ from those remaining on assistance, and to determine whether children born to those individuals removed from assistance receive services in other government programs.

V. Domestic Violence

Many welfare recipients are victims of violence at the hands of intimate partners. Evidence from Massachusetts suggests that about 20 percent of the women who received AFDC benefits in 1996 had been subjected to violence within the past year. Many more had been victimized in the past (Allard et al., 1997). In studies of welfare to work programs, domestic violence has been identified as a significant barrier to job training and employment.

The new welfare statute allows states to exempt battered women from various welfare program requirements. In keeping with these provisions, a number of states are planning to identify and provide services to battered recipients and consider exemptions when necessary. These states will need to include some type of data on this problem in their information systems. Data may also be available on women who have been involved with the judicial and law enforcement systems. For research purposes, it may be possible to link data across these systems to study differences in welfare participation between recipients who are battered and those who are not so identified. It may also be possible to identify supports provided to battered recipients.

Issues around domestic violence also play a role in determining whether applicants and recipients of TANF benefits must cooperate with the child support enforcement system or be given a good cause exemption. Despite the high rates of domestic violence, good cause is requested in less than .2 percent of TANF cases, and granted in about .1 percent of cases. There have been no studies linking reported incidents of domestic violence and the request for or granting of good cause.

VI. Substance Abuse and Mental Health

Clients with substance abuse and mental health disorders present particular challenges to welfare reform. Substance abuse is a significant barrier to self sufficiency for some welfare recipients. Estimates of the prevalence of substance abuse vary widely, but most estimates conclude 10–20 percent of adults receiving AFDC have substance abuse problems. The prevalence of substance abuse among particular subgroups of the welfare population, such as long term recipients, may be higher, although little data is currently available on this topic (National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, 1996). Among female substance abuse treatment clients with children in their households, 64 percent were found to rely on welfare income in the year prior to treatment admission (Gerstein et al., 1997). One recent study found that approximately 38 percent of both homeless and low income housed women had a current mental health disorder, and nearly 70 percent had one during their lifetimes (Bassuk et al., 1996). Many of the women with current disorders report receiving some type of mental health services.

It is assumed that persons with substance abuse and mental health disorders are likely to be over-represented in welfare receiving populations and particularly among those reaching time limits, failing to comply with program requirements, or subject to sanctions. To date, however, no information has been available to test these assumptions. It may be possible using administrative data from substance abuse and mental health treatment systems and/or the Medicaid program, to establish whether clients known to have substance abuse and mental health disorders (whether or not such disorders are known to welfare caseworkers) differ from other clients in their welfare utilization patterns.

Part III. Application Preparation and Evaluation Criteria

This part contains information on the preparation of an application for submission under this announcement, the forms necessary for submission and the evaluation criteria under which the

applications will be reviewed. Potential applicants should read this part carefully in conjunction with the information provided in Part II.

Application Forms

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

Length of Application

Applications should be as brief and concise as possible, but assure communication of the applicant's proposal to the reviewers. In no case shall the project narrative exceed 30 double spaced pages exclusive of appropriate attachments. Only relevant attachments should be included, for example, resumes of key personnel. Videotapes, brochures, and other promotional materials will be discarded and not reviewed. Project narratives should be formatted with 1 inch margins, no less than 10 point font, double spaced lines, with consecutively numbered pages.

Applications should be assembled as follows:

1. *Abstract:* Provide a one-page summary of the proposed project. The abstract should clearly identify the following: the data sources to be linked, the research agenda for the resulting data, and, where applicable, the priority topic listed in Part II above.

2. *Goals, Objectives, and Usefulness of Project:* Include an overview which describes the need for the proposed project; outlines the reasons why these particular data sources are appropriate; proposes a research agenda that utilizes the potential of the resulting data set; and describes in general how the proposed project will advance scientific knowledge and policy development. This section should also summarize the applicant's overall strategy that pertains to the use of administrative data in the evaluation of welfare reform strategies, and how ASPE's funding fits into the overall scheme of the project.

3. *Methodology and Design:* Provide a description and justification of how the proposed data-linking project will be completed, including methodologies, approach to be taken, data sources to be used and linked, and proposed research and analytic plans. This section should clearly identify which data sources will be used, the time-period that the data capture, the population covered by the data, and the method(s) which will be used to link the data. Additionally, a discussion of how the administrative data will be cleaned and checked for accuracy must be included. The proposals should also provide proof that the grantee has obtained the necessary authorization to access and link all data sources proposed within the scope of the project. The preferred form of proof is a signed interagency agreement with each of the relevant agencies/departments. Though not preferable, letters of support from the appropriate agencies are acceptable, provided that the letter clearly states that the proposing agency has the authorization to access and link all necessary data. This section should also include a concise and specific discussion of how the case or individual level data will be kept confidential. Applicants must assure that the collected data will only be used for management and research purposes, and that all information will be kept completely confidential, and should present the methods that will be used to ensure confidentiality of records and information once data are made available for research purposes.

4. *Experience of Personnel/Organizational Capacity:* Briefly describe the applicant's organizational capabilities and experience in conducting relevant projects using linked administrative program data. Identify the key staff who are expected to carry out the data organization and linking, as well as those who plan to conduct research with the resulting data. Provide a curriculum vitae for each person. Be sure to include a brief discussion of how each key staff member will contribute to the success of the project.

5. *Ability to Sustain Data Linkages After Completion of Funding:* A successful proposal must present evidence that the data linkages established in this project will become institutionalized into an on-going database. The proposal should describe how the linking of data will become institutionalized, which agency will have responsibility for and jurisdiction over the resulting data, what mechanisms will be instituted to determine who will have access to the data for program management, monitoring, and research purposes, and the sources of financial and staff support for maintaining the database. Proposals should also relate the extent to which the data will be used for future policy planning, research and evaluation.

6. *Work plan:* A Work plan should be included which describes the start and end dates of the project, the responsibilities of each of the key staff, and a time line which shows the sequence of tasks necessary for the completion of the project. Identify the other time commitments of key staff members, for example, their teaching or managerial responsibilities as well as other projects in which they are involved. The Work plan should include a discussion of any plans for dissemination of the results, such as papers, articles, or conference presentations, as well as any types of documentation for the data set that is to be produced through this grant. Finally, the work plan must include how the data linked under this grant will eventually be made available for research and evaluation purposes. If one or more public use tapes are anticipated, then this should be specified. If public use tapes are not planned, then the work plan must specify how interested and qualified researchers will be allowed access to the data.

7. *Budget:* Submit a request for Federal funds using Standard Form 424A and provide a proposed budget using the categories listed on this form. A narrative explanation of the budget should be included which explains in more detail what the funds will be used for. If other sources of funds are being received to support aspects of this research, the source, amount, and other relevant details must be included. The proposal should also clearly specify whether state support will be included, and if so, the type and amount of such support.

All applicants must budget for two trips to the Washington, DC area, for at least two people on each trip. As part of this grant, ASPE would like to schedule two meetings for all funded projects. The first meeting will be for planning purposes, where applicants will have the opportunity to meet, discuss their projects, and receive feedback from both the other grantees and from ASPE staff. This meeting will occur not more than two months after the proposals are funded. The second meeting will be approximately 6 to 8 months into the grant period, and will provide grantees the ability to meet and discuss their progress to date, and assess and receive assistance with any problems that have arisen.

Review Process and Funding information

Applications will be initially screened for compliance with the timeliness and completeness requirements. Five (5) copies of each application are required. One of these copies must be in an unbound format, suitable for copying. If judged in compliance, the application then will be reviewed by government personnel, augmented by outside experts where appropriate.

The panel will review the applications using the evaluation criteria listed below to score each

application. These review results will be the primary element used by the ASPE in making funding decisions.

HHS reserves the option to discuss applications with other Federal agencies, Central or Regional Office staff, specialists, experts, States and the general public. Comments from these sources, along with those of the reviewers, may be considered in making an award decision.

As a result of this competition, between 3 and 4 grants are expected to be made from funds appropriated for fiscal year 1997. Additional awards may be made depending on the extensiveness of the data involved and the available funding, including funds that may become available in FY98. The Department reserves the right to make fewer awards, if enough suitable proposals are not received. The average grant is expected to be between $100,000 and $125,000.

Deadline for Submission of Applications

The closing date for submission of applications under this announcement is August 18, 1997. 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 August 18, 1997 or (2) postmarked before midnight five days prior to August 18, 1997 and received in time to be considered during the competitive review process (within two weeks of the deadline date). Applications may not be faxed.

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.

Hand-delivered applications will be accepted Monday through Friday prior to and on August 18, 1997 during the hours of 9:00 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 202–690–8794 from the lobby for pickup. A staff person will be available to receive applications. Applications which do not meet the August 18, 1997 deadline will not be considered or reviewed. HHS will send a letter to this effect to each late applicant.

HHS reserves the right to extend the deadline for all applications if there is widespread disruption of the mail because of extreme weather conditions or natural disasters or if HHS determines an extension to be in the best interest 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.

Selection Process and Evaluation Criteria

Selection of the successful applicants will be based on the technical 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, strengths, weaknesses and recommendations.

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:

Evaluation Criteria

1. *Goals, Objectives, and Potential Usefulness of the Analyses* (20 points). Scoring will be based on the need for the project, the potential usefulness of the objectives, and how the anticipated results of the proposed project will advance policy development and program management. The research agenda will be scrutinized to determine whether the issues are relevant in the context of TANF, and whether the research questions can actually be addressed with administrative data. Scoring will also be based on the extent to which this specific project is representative of the applicant's overall plan for using administrative data to study the implementation and effectiveness of the TANF program, and how TANF interacts with other assistance programs. Preference will be given to those projects which link TANF data with administrative data from two or more other State or Federal social service assistance programs.

2. *Methodology and Design* (30 points). Scoring will be based on whether the data sources included are appropriate for carrying out the proposed research agenda, including the time frame of the data linked and the population covered by the data. Concerning the time-frame of the data, preference will also be given to those projects which link historical data (pre-TANF implementation), as well as data collected subsequent to the date which the state TANF program became operational. A critical scoring element will be the proposal's discussion of the methods used to clean, standardize and link the case level data from the different sources. Applicants should discuss thoroughly how they intend to match case records from different data sources, and what internal validity checks will ensure the accuracy of the matches. The architecture for the resulting data set should also be discussed thoroughly. Other design considerations include whether the agency applying has already obtained authorization to obtain and use data from the different state or local agencies whose data would be linked, and how confidentiality of the records and information will be ensured. It applicants are unable to ensure the security of information included in the project, then it is highly unlikely that they will receive funding.

3. *Qualifications of Personnel and Organizational Capability* (20 points). The principle scoring criteria are the qualifications of the project personnel involved as evidenced by their professional training and experience. Proposals should clearly articulate the experience of applicable staff in similar projects that deal with linking administrative data and assembling large databases. The capacity of the organization to provide the infrastructure and support necessary for the project is also an important concern.

4. *Work Plan and Budget* (15 points). Is the plan reasonable? Are the activities sufficiently detailed to ensure successful, timely implementation? Do they demonstrate an adequate level of understanding by the applicant of the practical problems of conducting such a project? Is the proposed budget reasonable and sufficient to ensure completion of the project?

5. *Ability to Sustain Project After Funding (15 points).* How will the linking of data sources become an institutionalized function within the agency once the grant funding expires? Where will the newly created data set reside? What agency(ies) will have responsibility for and jurisdiction over the resulting data? What are the sources of financial and staff support for maintaining the database? How will the linked data be used for future policy planning, research and evaluation?

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 an amount of funds and subject to such conditions as are deemed necessary or desirable for the research project; or (b) disapprove the application; or defer action on the application for such reasons as a 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 the award will be issued to notify the applicant of the approved application.

3. The Assistant Secretary's Discretion

Nothing in this announcement should be construed as to obligate the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation to make any awards whatsoever. Awards and the distribution of awards among the priority areas are contingent on the needs of the Department at any point in time and the quality of the applications which are received.

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. A Table of Contents;
5. Budget Justification for Section B—Budget Categories;
6. Proof of nonprofit status, if appropriate;
7. A 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) Abstract,
(b) Goals, Objectives and Usefulness of the Project,
(c) Methodology and design,
(d) Background of the Personnel and Organizational Capabilities and
(e) Work plan (timetable);
9. Any appendices/attachments;
10. Certification Regarding Drug-Free Work place;
11. Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters;
12. Certification and, if necessary, Disclosure Regarding Lobbying;

Reports

The grantee must submit quarterly progress reports and a final report. The specific format and content for these reports will be provided by the project officer.

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 does not directly affect State and local governments. Applicants are not required to seek intergovernmental review of their applications within the constraints of E.O. No. 12372.

Dated: June 13, 1997.

David F. Garrison,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

[FR Doc. 97–16083 Filed 6–18–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4151–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Availability of Report of NIH Panel To Define Principles of Therapy of HIV Infection and Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in HIV-Infected Adults

AGENCY: Office of Public Health and Science, HHS.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Office of Public Health and Science, is requesting comments from all interested parties on the following two documents: ''Report of the NIH Panel to Define Principles of Therapy of HIV Infection'' developed by the subject NIH Panel and ''Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents,'' developed by the Panel on Clinical Practices for Treatment of HIV Infection, convened by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation. The principles of therapy document describes 11 scientific principles that define the fundamental HIV pathogenic-based rationale for guiding therapeutic decisions. The guidelines document contains recommendations for practitioners in conjunction with patients to use in providing appropriate treatment regimens in light of new combination therapies. The guidelines cover the following areas: methods for testing to establish HIV infection; considerations for when to initiate therapy; methods for and frequency of monitoring the effectiveness of therapy; therapy in patients with established and advanced stage disease; the treatment of acute HIV infection; interruption of therapy; considerations for changing therapy and available therapeutic options; and considerations for therapy in the HIV-infected pregnant woman.

DATES: Written comments should be written on or before July 21, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments to this notice should be submitted to: The HIV/AIDS Treatment Information Service, P.O. Box 6363, Rockville, MD 20849–6303. Due to the significantly large response expected, only written comments will be accepted. After consideration of the comments, the final documents will be published in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) ''Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report'' (MMWR). A notice of their availability will also be published in the **Federal Register.**

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Copies of the ''Report of the NIH Panel to Define Principles of Therapy'' and ''Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents'' are available from the National AIDS Clearinghouse (1–800–458–5231) and on the Clearinghouse website (hhtp://www.cdcnac.org) and from the HIV/AIDS Treatment Information Service (1–800–448–0400; FAX 301–529–6616; TTY: (1–800–243–7012) and on their website (http://www.hivatis.org).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NIH Panel to Define Principles of Therapy of HIV Infection was convented to conduct a review of the current status of the clinical studies of HIV antiretroviral therapy with the goal of delineating scientific principles that would guide therapeutic decisions. The NIH Panel was chaired by Charles Carpenter, M.D., Professor of Medicine, Brown University School of Medicine. The Panel on Clinical Practice for Treatment of HIV Infection is a three-year public/private partnership convened in December 1996 by Eric P. Goosby, M.D., Director, Office of HIV/AIDS Policy, DHHS, and Mark Smith, M.D., former Vice President of the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, at the request of DHHS Secretary Donna E. Shalala. The Panel's mission is to develop an initial set of comprehensive clinical practices providing current state-of-the-art recommendations, options and guidance to practitioners, patients, and payers regarding effective and appropriate treatment for HIV infection on a variety of areas. The Panel is cochaired by Anthony S. Fauci, M.D., Director,