DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–4368–N–01]

Notice of Funding Availability for Research to Improve the Evaluation and Control of Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazards

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary—Office of Lead Hazard Control, HUD.

ACTION: Notice of funding availability (NOFA) for research to improve the evaluation and control of residential lead-based paint hazards for fiscal year 1998.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of funding of up to approximately $2 million for grants or cooperative agreements for research on specified topics related to the evaluation and control of residential lead-based paint hazards. Approximately 5 to 10 grants or cooperative agreements of approximately $100,000 to $600,000 each will be awarded on a competitive basis. The application kit developed for this NOFA provides details to guide and assist applicants. In the body of this NOFA is information concerning: the purpose and background of the NOFA and the available amounts; eligible applicants; specific topics on which research grant applications will be accepted; selection criteria; and the application requirements and steps involved in the application process. An appendix to the NOFA identifies documents referenced in the NOFA.

APPLICATION DUE DATES: Completed applications must be submitted no later than 6:00 pm, local time, on July 21, 1998 to the addresses shown below. See below for specific procedures governing the form of application submissions (e.g., mailed applications, express mail, overnight delivery, or hand carried).

Mailed applications. Mailed applications will be considered timely filed if postmarked on or before 12:00 midnight on the application due date and received by the Office of Lead Hazard Control on or within ten (10) days of July 21, 1998.

Applications Sent by Overnight/Express Mail Delivery. Applications sent by overnight delivery or express mail will be considered timely filed if received before or on the application due date, or upon submission of documentary evidence that they were placed in transit with the overnight delivery service by no later than the specified application due date.

Hand carried applications. Hand carried applications will be accepted at the specified location and room number during normal business hours on or before the application due date. On the application due date, business hours will be extended to 6:00 PM.

All applications must include an original and two copies of the completed application. Section III.(A) of this NOFA provides further information on what constitutes proper submission of an application.

ADDRESSES AND APPLICATION SUBMISSION PROCEDURES: *Address-Mailed applications.* The address for mailed applications is: Office of Lead Hazard Control (LS), Department of Housing and Urban Development, Room B–133, 451 7th Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20410. *Address—Overnight/Express Mail or Hand carried applications.* Hand carried applications should be delivered to Suite 3206, 490 L'Enfant Plaza, SW Washington, DC 20024.

FOR APPLICATION KITS, FURTHER INFORMATION, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: *For Application Kits:* Application kits may be obtained from the Office of Lead Hazard Control, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW, Room B–133, Washington, DC 20410, or by calling Ms. Gail Ward at 202–755–1785, extension 111 (this is not a toll-free number), or by making an e-mail request to: Gail__N.__Ward@hud.gov (use underscore characters). The Department is also planning to make the NOFA and application kit accessible via the Internet World Wide Web (http://www.hud.gov/lea/leahome.html). Completed applications, however, must be submitted in paper copy to the mailing address; faxed or electronically transmitted applications will not be accepted. Hearing- and speech-impaired persons may access the above telephone number via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Information Relay Service at 1–800–877–8339.

For Further Information: Dr. Peter Ashley, Office of Lead Hazard Control, at the address above; telephone (202) 755–1785, extension 115, or Ms. Karen Williams, Grants Officer, extension 118 (these are not toll-free numbers). Hearing- and speech-impaired persons may access the above telephone numbers via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Information Relay Service at 1–800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Authority; Purpose; Amounts Allocated; Background; Eligible Applicants and Eligible Activities

(A) Authority

These grants are authorized under sections 1051 and 1052 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, which is Title X of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992.

(B) Purpose

Research grants or cooperative agreements will be awarded, at HUD's discretion, to selected applicants in order to fund research activities that address critical gaps in our knowledge of residential lead hazard identification and control. The purposes of this program include:

(1) Funding research on topics identified in sections 1051 and 1052 of Title X.

(2) Funding research that will be used to update the HUD *Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing (Guidelines)* and which is anticipated to:

(a) Increase the accuracy and cost-effectiveness of lead hazard evaluation, and

(b) Increase the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of lead hazard reduction.

(C) Amounts Allocated

Up to approximately $2 million will be available to fund research proposals in FY 1998. Grants or cooperative agreements will be awarded on a competitive basis following evaluation of all proposals according to the Rating Factors described in section III.(B). HUD anticipates that individual awards will range from approximately $100,000 to approximately $600,000. HUD reserves the right to grant one or more awards, or no awards, for research in a given topic area, depending on the quality of applications received.

(D) Background

Lead is a potent toxicant that targets the central nervous system and is particularly damaging to the neurological development of young children and the developing fetus. Pregnant women can transfer lead through the placenta to the developing fetus. Lead-based paint is the most widespread and dangerous source of lead in the residential environment. Children can be exposed directly to this source of lead by ingesting paint chips or indirectly through exposure to paint-lead that has entered house dust and soil from the deterioration of interior and/or exterior lead-based paint. Studies have shown that the primary source of lead exposure for most young children is through the contact and subsequent incidental ingestion of house dust (i.e., through hand-to-mouth activity). The amount of lead found in the ambient air, food and public drinking water has decreased

significantly over the last two decades as a result of regulatory action and voluntary process changes.

Of all occupied housing units built before the ban of lead-based paint in 1978, approximately 83 percent, or 64 million housing units, are estimated to have lead-based paint somewhere on the exterior or interior of the building. Although intact lead-based paint poses little immediate risk to occupants, non-intact paint which is chipping, peeling, or otherwise deteriorating may present an immediate risk. Therefore, of particular concern are the housing units that contain deteriorated lead-based paint and/or lead-contaminated dust and are occupied by young children.

HUD has been actively engaged in a number of activities relating to lead-based paint as a result of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (LBPPPA) of 1971, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 4801–4846. Sections 1051 and 1052 of Title X (42 U.S.C. 4854 and 4854a) call for the Secretary of HUD, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to conduct research on specific topics related to the evaluation and subsequent mitigation of residential lead hazards. This research program also implements, in part, HUD's Departmental Strategy for Achieving Environmental Justice pursuant to Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations).

On November 27, 1996 (61 FR 60500), HUD published a NOFA announcing the availability of funds to support research to improve the evaluation and control of lead-based paint hazards. The Department made a total of 10 research grant awards to applicants to that NOFA, for a total of approximately $3.5 million. Research topic areas that were funded included: Cleaning leaded dust from smooth surfaces and carpets using low phosphate detergents and household vacuums; sampling leaded dust in carpets and upholstery; field validation of the approach to lead risk assessment suggested in the HUD *Guidelines;* the distribution of and exposure to dust in carpets; factors affecting the cleanability of carpets; comparison of composite and single dust-wipe sampling for clearance and risk assessment; analysis of lead-based paint inspection data for multifamily housing to develop a statistically based sampling scheme; penetration of fine particulate through household vacuum cleaner collection bags; development of a protocol to assess the use of portable XRF analyzers to test for lead in dust-wipe samples; development of a protocol for evaluating the performance of chemical spot-test-kits for detecting lead-based paint; and, the reaccumulation of leaded dust following professional dust cleaning.

In June 1995, HUD published *Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint in Housing (Guidelines)* (see Appendix A of this NOFA). The *Guidelines* are a report on state-of-the-art procedures for all aspects of lead-based paint hazard evaluation and control. The *Guidelines* reflect the Title X framework for lead hazard control, which distinguishes three types of control measures: Interim controls, abatement of lead-based paint hazards, and complete abatement of all lead-based paint. Interim controls are designed to address hazards quickly, inexpensively, and temporarily, while abatement is intended to produce a permanent solution. While the *Guidelines* recommend procedures that are effective in identifying and controlling lead hazards while protecting the health of abatement workers and occupants, HUD recognizes that targeted research and field experience will result in future changes to the *Guidelines* that will improve the accuracy of lead hazard evaluation and increase the effectiveness, while possibly reducing costs, of lead hazard control measures. HUD anticipates that increasing the cost-effectiveness of procedures for lead hazard evaluation and control will reduce barriers to the widespread adoption of these measures.

In July 1995, the Task Force on Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction and Financing, which was established pursuant to section 1015 of Title X, presented its final report to HUD and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Task Force Report, entitled ''Putting the Pieces Together: Controlling Lead Hazards in the Nation's Housing'' (see Appendix A of this NOFA), recommended that research be conducted on a number of key topics in order to address significant gaps in our knowledge of lead exposure and hazard control.

(E) Eligible Applicants

Academic and not-for-profit institutions located in the U.S., and State and local governments are eligible under all existing authorizations. Non-profits must submit proof of their nonprofit status. For-profit firms also are eligible; however, they are not allowed to earn a fee (i.e., no profit can be made from the project). Federal agencies and Federal employees are not eligible to submit applications. All applicants must comply with all civil rights laws, statutes, regulations, and executive orders. If an applicant has: (1) An outstanding finding of civil rights violations by any Federal, state, or local agency; or (2) is the defendant in a civil rights lawsuit filed by the Department of Justice, the applicant is not eligible to apply for funding under this NOFA until the applicant resolves such charge, lawsuit, or letter of findings to the satisfaction of the oversight Agency.

(F) Eligible Activities.

The following types of research are eligible activities under this NOFA:

(1) General Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of this research is to gain knowledge that will lead to improvements in the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of methods used for lead-based paint hazard evaluation and control. It is anticipated that this will eventually result in a reduction in the magnitude of childhood lead exposure nationwide by reducing barriers to the implementation of widespread lead-based paint hazard reduction interventions and improving the effectiveness of such interventions.

Specific objectives for the individual research topics listed in section I.(F)(1) are provided separately in the expanded discussion of these individual topic areas that follows in section I.(F)(2). Although HUD is soliciting proposals for research on these specific topics, the Department will also consider funding applications for research on topics which, although not specifically listed in section I.(F)(2), are relevant under the overall goals and objectives of this research, as described above. In such instances, the applicant should describe how the proposed research activity addresses these overall goals and objectives. Key research topics that are to be addressed through this NOFA include the following (each of these topics is discussed in more detail in section I.(F)(2) of this NOFA):

(a) Treatment of lead-contaminated residential soils;

(b) Friction surfaces as a lead-based paint hazard;

(c) Effectiveness of State and local laws requiring periodic interventions to reduce lead hazards in rental housing;

(d) Efficacy of the current guidance on conducting risk assessments of multifamily housing; and,

(e) Other areas of research that are consistent with the overall goals of this NOFA.

(2) Background and Objectives for Specific Research Topic Areas

(a) *Treatment of Lead-Contaminated Soils.*

(i) *General.* Soils can become lead contaminated as a result of the shedding

of leaded paint from the exterior of structures and by the deposition of airborne particulate lead. Before the removal of lead from gasoline, vehicular emissions were a significant source of airborne lead, especially in urban areas. Children can be exposed to lead in soil and exterior dust through direct contact and incidental ingestion, and indirectly as a result of soil or dust being tracked or blown into the home and becoming incorporated into house dust. The degree to which soil-lead is a hazard depends upon the potential for contact and the lead concentration of the soil.

The HUD *Guidelines* (Chapter 5) indicate that bare soils should be considered hazardous if they exceed 400 ppm Pb in ''high contact'' areas (e.g., play areas) and if they exceed 2,000 ppm Pb in other areas of the yard. The *Guidelines* further indicate that outside of high contact areas, hazard control measures are not required unless the surface area for bare soils exceeds 9 ft2. The *Guidelines* are generally consistent with interim standards for lead in soil that have been published by the U.S. EPA (Guidance on the Identification of Lead-Based Paint Hazards, 60 FR 47247; September 11, 1995). The EPA is expected to publish proposed health based standards for lead in residential soil in 1998, as required by section 403 of Title X. These standards may differ from the current HUD and EPA guidance on lead-contaminated soils.

Soil-lead hazards can be mitigated using approaches that can be described as either temporary, interim controls, or long term abatement measures (i.e., interventions that remain effective for at least 20 years). Interim controls include various means of covering bare soil, such as with grass, gravel, or mulch. Land use controls can also be employed and include measures such as fencing and changing the location of play equipment. Interim controls are generally low cost and relatively easy to employ; however, they require frequent monitoring following implementation to ensure that they remain effective.

Current EPA and HUD guidance calls for residential soils to be abated if soil-lead levels exceed 5,000 ppm. Soil abatement includes such measures as covering soil with impervious materials like concrete or asphalt, or removing contaminated soils for off-site disposal. Another, more experimental approach, includes removing soil for on-site treatment that removes lead, followed by replacing the ''cleaned'' soil. Because of the high cost of soil abatement methods, in conjunction with other barriers to their implementation (e.g., disposing of lead-contaminated soils), these methods are impractical for widespread adoption.

Other approaches to reducing soil-lead hazards cannot be readily characterized as either interim controls or soil abatement. An example of such an approach, that has not been evaluated scientifically, is tilling the soil to reduce the lead concentration at the soil surface. Another example is the untested concept of treating soil with a substance (e.g., ground phosphate rock) that would reduce the biological availability (i.e., the degree to which the lead is absorbed into the bloodstream following ingestion) of the soil-lead to humans.

Relatively little research has been reported on the effectiveness of residential soil treatments in reducing children's lead exposures. There is at least one report of a study in which the use of interim soil hazard reduction measures combined with interior dust controls resulted in statistically significant reductions in the blood-lead (PbB) of children in the intervention group as compared to those in the control group (Mielke et al. 1992). The EPA-funded ''Three City Study'' assessed the impact of residential or neighborhood soil and dust abatement on children's blood lead levels (USEPA 1996). A small effect (a decline) on the mean blood lead of children was observed following soil abatement at one study site. The lack of an observed intervention-related effect at the other two study sites could have been related to a number of factors associated with the specific locations and study designs, and should not be considered conclusive regarding the relative importance of exterior dust and soil as lead exposure sources.

The major goals of this research are to improve methods for assessing potential risks from soil-lead exposure, to determine the long-term effectiveness of various methods of reducing residential soil-lead hazards, and to identify novel, cost-effective approaches to reducing or eliminating residential soil-lead hazards.

(ii) *Specific Research Objectives.* Specific research objectives include the following:

(*1*) Assess selected existing methods, and identify and assess novel, cost-effective methods for reducing or eliminating residential soil-lead hazards;

(*2*) Assess the adequacy of the current EPA (1994 interim guidelines and 1998 proposed rule) and HUD (1995) guidelines for estimating residential soil-lead hazards (e.g., area of bare soil for a hazardous condition, soil sampling guidelines); and

(*3*) Improve knowledge regarding the relative importance of exterior dust and soil as lead exposure sources for children in various residential environments.

(b) *Friction Surfaces as a Lead-Based Paint Hazard.*

(i) *General.* Friction surfaces are those surfaces covered with lead-based paint that are subject to abrasion, which may result in the generation of leaded dust. Because of this, friction surfaces are included in the definition of lead-based paint hazard in the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (Title X). The portions of a window that rub together when the window is operated are generally considered the most critical of the friction surfaces within a residence, in terms of their ability to generate leaded dust. Other common residential friction surfaces include tight-fitting doors, cabinet doors and drawers, stairway treads, and floors painted with lead-based paint.

Addressing the hazard caused by windows and doors that generate leaded dust can represent the highest costs associated with a residential lead hazard control intervention. Because of this, it is important that we improve our understanding of the circumstances under which these friction surfaces pose an actual hazard because of leaded dust generation. It may generally be the case that windows and doors in good working condition and with intact lead-based paint, create relatively little leaded dust and thus can be managed in place with limited intervention.

Because there are often a number of different potential lead hazards in and around a dwelling (e.g., lead in exterior dust and soil, interior and exterior surfaces with deteriorated lead-based paint), it is often not possible to attribute dust-lead on a particular surface to the presence of a nearby friction surface painted with lead-based paint. For example, it has been reported by some researchers and lead hazard control practitioners that the lead loadings on window troughs are occasionally found to exceed the HUD/EPA standard of 800 μg Pb/ft^2 when sampled at various intervals following window treatment (e.g., wet-scraping and repainting surfaces, installing a trough liner). In such situations it is often difficult to determine the primary source (e.g., friction between window surfaces, exterior dust accumulation) of the reaccumulated dust-lead with reasonable certainty.

Research is needed to help improve our understanding of the situations in which friction surfaces are significant sources of the leaded dust that

accumulates on accessible surfaces within a dwelling. This knowledge is needed to improve existing guidance for evaluating and controlling lead-based paint hazards associated with friction surfaces, which would help to ensure the most cost effective use of scarce lead hazard control resources.

(ii) *Specific Research Objectives.* The primary goal of this research is improve our understanding of the situations in which friction between painted components is a significant source of dust-lead on accessible surfaces within a residence. Specific research objectives include:

(*1*) Identify circumstances under which painted friction surfaces (e.g., windows and doors) generate significant amounts of leaded dust within dwellings;

(*2*) Develop a cost effective method for identifying the likely source(s) of dust-lead on surfaces within a dwelling; and

(*3*) Identify and characterize situations in which it is preferable to replace friction-generating components, such as windows, because of the continued generation of leaded dust, and those situations in which it is preferable to manage these components in place.

(c) *The Effectiveness of Laws Requiring Periodic Interventions to Reduce Lead Hazards in Rental Housing*

(i) *General.* The Task Force on Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction and Financing was mandated by Title X for the purpose of providing consensus recommendations on methods to deal with the multifaceted problem of lead hazards in housing. One suggestion for preventing lead hazards in rental housing was that property owners perform ''essential maintenance practices'' on pre-1978 properties at regular intervals. Essential maintenance practices (EMPs) are relatively inexpensive actions intended to reduce the chance that lead hazards will develop and to prevent the inadvertent creation of lead hazards. EMPs can be completed by trained maintenance workers during the performance of standard maintenance. EMPs that were identified by the Task Force include the use of ''safe work practices'' when disturbing LBP, periodic inspection for and safe repair of deteriorated paint, providing LBP hazard information to tenants, and training maintenance staff.

The Task Force also identified ''standard treatments'' that can be implemented by property owners for the purpose of controlling lead hazards in high priority (e.g., pre-1950) housing. Standard treatments are routine interventions that can be performed by a trained maintenance crew, and include such practices as repair of deteriorated paint, creating smooth and cleanable horizontal surfaces, treating friction surfaces, preventing exposure to bare lead-contaminated soil, and conducting specialized cleaning upon completion of treatments.

Several states have passed, or are considering, legislation requiring the owners of rental property of a given age to perform specific actions (i.e., combinations of EMPs and/or standard treatments) on their properties at unit turnover or at a specified frequency. Vermont passed a law in 1996 (Act 165) that covers rental properties built before 1978. The law requires property owners to adopt a number of practices, including many of the EMPs identified by the Title X Task Force, such as periodic inspection and repair of painted surfaces and the periodic cleaning of window troughs and sills using specialized cleaning methods. Rental property owners or their representatives are also required to be trained in the proper application of EMPs.

In 1994, Maryland passed a law (House Bill 760) that applies to all privately owned rental housing built before 1950, and at the owner's option, to rental housing built after 1949. The law requires risk reduction treatments or lead dust tests in affected properties at change of occupancy. The required treatments include, but are not limited to, visual review and repair of painted surfaces, making floors and window wells smooth and cleanable, and conducting specialized dust cleaning of interior surfaces. Instead of conducting risk reduction treatments, property owners can opt to show that a lead hazard does not exist in a property by subjecting the unit to dust wipe testing. Property owners who comply with all aspects of the Maryland law are shielded from tort liability resulting from the lead poisoning of a tenant.

The Vermont and Maryland laws do not require dust-lead testing immediately following treatment of units or during the intervening period between treatments. Research is needed to assess the degree to which these or similar laws (e.g., requiring the implementation of EMPs and/or standard treatments) succeed in creating and maintaining lead-safe environments in the large variety of applicable rental housing units to which they apply. Any research on the effectiveness of these or similar (e.g., local) laws should also examine important programmatic factors such as the degree of compliance with the laws, costs and benefits of the legislation, public attitudes towards the laws, etc. The results of this research will be important in the identification of specific aspects of the laws (and implementing programs) that are effective in reducing the prevalence and severity of lead hazards in rental housing, as well as identifying those aspects that may require modification.

(ii) *Specific Research Objectives.* The primary goal of this research is to assess the effectiveness of current state or local laws requiring periodic implementation of essential maintenance practices and/or standard treatments in achieving and maintaining lead safe environments in targeted rental property, such as those implemented in Maryland and Vermont. Specific research objectives include:

(*1*) Identify the variables (e.g., housing characteristics) that are significant predictors of the success/failure of the required treatments in creating lead safe environments;

(*2*) Estimate the costs and benefits of the programs to various stakeholders (e.g., property owners, tenants, general public); and

(*3*) Identify both effective aspects of the evaluated programs as well as aspects where modifications are suggested.

(d) *Lead Hazard Risk Assessment of Multifamily Housing.*

(i) *General.* A lead-based paint hazard risk assessment is an on-site investigation of a dwelling for the purpose of identifying any lead-based paint hazards. Risk assessments include, but are not limited to, a visual assessment and limited environmental sampling, and creation of a written report with results and recommendations. It is also suggested that a risk assessor, to the extent feasible, conduct an investigation of the history and management of a dwelling and the age of the residents. Chapter 5 of the HUD Guidelines provides guidance on conducting risk assessments in single and multifamily housing. The described approaches for conducting lead hazard risk assessments in multifamily housing include methods that are based on targeted, worst case, and random sampling.

Targeted sampling involves the selection of dwellings deemed most likely to contain LBP hazards. These units are identified primarily through information that is supplied by the owner (i.e., verbally and/or through written records). Examples of criteria for selecting units to be sampled include condition (e.g., select if ''poor''), the presence of children under age 6, and recent preparation for reoccupancy. A limitation of condition-based targeting is that most owners have little knowledge of lead risk assessment, and may unintentionally fail to identify the

units most likely to have LBP hazards. The Guidelines also provide a minimum number of units to be sampled in conducting risk assessments of similar multifamily units in developments of various sizes. The values provided were in part derived from a public housing risk assessment/insurance program.

The other approaches discussed in the Guidelines for choosing units to be assessed, worst case and random sampling, are suggested for use when there is not adequate information on which to select a target sample. They would be more costly than the targeted approach in most cases. The worst-case sampling approach requires an initial visual inspection of all units with subsequent selection of those in poorest condition, while the random sampling method requires the random selection of a statistically based sample, as is required for conducting lead-based paint inspections. The statistically based random sample generally requires the selection of many more units than targeted sampling.

A focused research effort is needed to assess the adequacy of the current HUD guidance for conducting risk assessments of multifamily developments. Research efforts could include the analysis of existing data from past risk assessments of multifamily developments (e.g., public housing) and/or the generation and analysis of new data generated from the assessment of a limited number of multifamily developments. As part of an evaluation of multifamily risk assessment guidance, consideration should be given as to how an assessor should characterize the results of a multifamily risk assessment in a manner that would maximize its utility to the client. If no lead hazards are identified, or if a clear pattern in the occurrence of lead hazards emerges, the reporting of results is straightforward. Other findings, however, are more difficult to characterize, such as the situation in which some lead hazards are detected with no apparent pattern of occurrence.

(ii) *Specific Research Objectives.* The major objective is to assess the utility of the current HUD guidance on conducting lead-based paint hazard risk assessments in multifamily developments and to identify changes that could be made to improve this guidance. Specific research objectives include:

(*1*) Assess the utility of a ''targeted sampling'' approach in identifying lead hazards in multifamily housing in contrast to other approaches (e.g., random sampling); and

(*2*) Evaluate the current guidance on the minimum number of units to be assessed in targeted risk assessments of multifamily housing.

(e) *Other Relevant Research.* HUD will also consider funding applications for research on topics which, although not specifically identified in this NOFA, are relevant under the overall objective of improving the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of methods for the evaluation and control of lead-based paint hazards. At this time, the Department does not have an interest, however, in funding research on the development or evaluation of analytical methods (i.e., standard methods for processing and analyzing environmental lead samples) or the development of commercial products for lead hazard evaluation and control. All applications must comply with all requirements, including sections II. and IV., of this NOFA.

Other research topics that are of interest to HUD include, but are not limited to:

(i) Assessment of the level of worker protection required for typical lead hazard abatement and control activities (i.e., as determined by personal exposure monitoring) with respect to evaluations of the type of work, properties of the work surfaces, training and experience of workers and supervisors, etc.

(ii) The degree to which it is necessary to follow the approach recommended in the HUD *Guidelines* (Chapter 14) for clean-up (e.g., washing walls and ceilings, use of a HEPA vacuum and high phosphate detergents) following the completion of various lead hazard control interventions.

(3) *Future Research Solicitations.* If funding for research to improve the evaluation and control of residential lead-based paint hazards is available to HUD in future fiscal years, HUD will republish this NOFA and additional applications will be solicited under a new competition and applications will be due 45 days from the publishing date. Topic areas will include one or more of the following:

(a) *Research on lead exposure from other sources.* This research will focus on strategies to reduce the risk of lead exposure from other sources, including:

(i) Exterior soil as a source of lead contamination;

(ii) Interior lead dust as a source of lead contamination;

(iii) Lead contamination in carpets;

(iv) Lead contamination in furniture; and

(v) Lead contamination in forced air ducts.

(b) *Research on lead testing technologies.* This research will focus on improving evaluation and control methods and their application, including:

(i) Developing improved methods for evaluating lead-based paint hazards in housing.

(ii) Developing improved methods for reducing lead-based paint hazards in housing.

(iii) Developing improved methods for measuring lead in paint films, dust, and soil samples.

(iv) Establishing performance standards for various detection methods, including spot test kits.

(v) Establishing performance standards for lead-based paint hazard reduction methods, including the use of encapsulants.

(c) Establishing appropriate cleanup standards.

(d) Evaluating the efficacy of interim controls in various hazard situations.

(e) Evaluating the relative performance of various abatement techniques.

(f) Evaluating the long-term cost-effectiveness of interim control and abatement strategies.

(g) Assessing the effectiveness of hazard evaluation and reduction activities funded by Title X.

II. Program Requirements

(A) Threshold Requirements.

(1) Compliance With Fair Housing and Civil Rights Laws

All applicants must comply with all applicable Fair Housing and civil rights laws, statutes, regulations and executive orders as enumerated in 24 CFR 5.105(a). If an applicant (1) has been charged with a violation of the Fair Housing Act by the Secretary; (2) is the defendant in a Fair Housing Act lawsuit filed by the Department of Justice; or (3) has received a letter of noncompliance findings under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, or Section 109 of the Housing and Community Development Act, the applicant is not eligible to apply for funding under this NOFA until the applicant resolves such charge, lawsuit, or letter of findings to the satisfaction of the Department.

(2) Additional Nondiscrimination Requirements

Applicants must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972.

(B) Definitions

The following definitions apply to this grant program:

Abatement—Any set of measures designed to permanently eliminate lead-

based paint or lead-based paint hazards. For the purposes of this definition, ''permanent'' means at least 20 years effective life. Abatement includes:

(1) The removal of lead-based paint and lead-contaminated dust, the permanent enclosure or encapsulation of lead-based paint, the replacement of components or fixtures painted with lead-based paint, and the removal or permanent covering of soil; and

(2) All preparation, cleanup, disposal, and post-abatement clearance testing activities associated with such measures.

Cleaning—The process of using a HEPA vacuum and/or wet cleaning agents to remove leaded dust; the process includes the removing of bulk debris from work area.

Clearance examination—The visual examination and collection of environmental samples by an inspector or risk assessor upon completion of an abatement project or an interim control intervention. The clearance examination is conducted to ensure that lead exposure levels do not exceed HUD-recommended clearance standards. These recommended standards will be superseded by standards that are in the process of being established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator pursuant to Title IV of the Toxic Substances Control Act, or other appropriate standards.

Encapsulation—The application of any covering or coating that acts as a barrier between the lead-based paint and the environment and that relies for its durability on adhesion between the encapsulant and the painted surface, and on the integrity of the existing bonds between paint layers, and between the paint and the substrate.

Friction surface—Any painted interior or exterior surface, such as a window or stair tread, subject to abrasion or friction.

Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing (June 1995)—HUD's manual of lead hazard control practices (commonly referred to as the *Guidelines*) which provide detailed, comprehensive, technical information on how to identify lead-based paint hazards in housing and how to control such hazards safely and efficiently. (The *Guidelines* replace the HUD ''Lead-Based Paint: Interim Guidelines for Hazard Identification and Abatement in Public and Indian Housing.'')

HEPA Vacuum—(High Efficiency Particulate Air)—A vacuum cleaner fitted with a filter capable of removing particles of 0.3 microns or larger at 99.97 percent or greater efficiency from the exhaust air stream.

Impact surface—An interior or exterior surface (such as surfaces on doors) subject to damage by repeated impact or contact.

Interim Controls—A set of measures designed to temporarily reduce human exposure or possible exposure to lead-based paint hazards. Such measures include specialized cleaning, repairs, maintenance, painting, temporary containment, and management and resident education programs. Interim controls include dust removal; paint film stabilization; treatment of friction and impact surfaces; installation of soil coverings, such as grass or sod; and restricting access to lead-contaminated soil.

Lead-Based Paint—Any paint, varnish, shellac, or other coating that contains lead equal to or greater than 1.0 $\mu g/cm^2$ as measured by XRF or laboratory analysis, or 0.5 percent by weight (5,000 μg/g, 5,000 ppm, or 5,000 mg/kg) as measured by laboratory analysis. (Local definitions may vary.)

Lead-Based Paint Hazard—Any condition which causes exposure to lead from lead-contaminated dust, lead-contaminated soil, lead-based paint that is deteriorated or present in accessible surfaces, friction surfaces, or impact surfaces that would result in adverse human health effects (as established by the EPA Administrator under Title IV of the Toxic Substances Control Act).

Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control—Activities to control and eliminate lead-based hazards, including interim controls and abatement of lead-based paint hazards or lead-based paint.

Lead-Contaminated Dust—Surface dust in residences that contains an area or mass concentration of lead in excess of the standard to be established by the EPA Administrator, pursuant to Title IV of the Toxic Substances Control Act. Until the EPA standards are established, the HUD-recommended clearance and risk assessment standards for leaded dust are 100 $\mu g/ft^2$ on floors, 500 $\mu g/ft^2$ on interior window sills, and 800 $\mu g/ft^2$ on window troughs (wells), exterior concrete or other rough surfaces.

Lead-Contaminated Soil—Bare soil on residential property that contains lead in excess of the standard established by the EPA Administrator, pursuant to Title IV of the Toxic Substances Control Act. The HUD-recommended standard and interim EPA guidance is 400 μg/g for high-contact play areas and 2,000 μg/g in other bare areas of the yard. Soil contaminated with lead at levels greater than or equal to 5,000 μg/g should be abated by removal or paving.

Lead hazard screen—A means of determining whether a residence in relatively good condition should have a full risk assessment.

Replacement—A strategy of abatement that entails the removal of building components coated with lead-based paint (such as windows, doors, and trim) and the installation of new components free of lead-based paint.

Residential Dwelling—This term means either:

(1) A single-family dwelling, including attached structures, such as porches and stoops; or

(2) A single-family dwelling unit in a structure that contains more than one separate residential dwelling unit and in which each unit is, or is intended to be used or occupied, in whole or in part, as the home or residence of one or more persons.

Risk Assessment—An on-site investigation of a residential dwelling to discover any lead-based paint hazards. Risk assessments include an investigation of the age, history, management, maintenance of the dwelling, and the number of children under age 6 and women of child-bearing age who are residents; a visual assessment; limited environmental sampling (i.e., collection of dust wipe samples, soil samples, and deteriorated paint samples); and preparation of a report identifying acceptable abatement and interim control strategies based on specific conditions.

Substrate—A surface on which paint, varnish, or other coating has been applied or may be applied. Examples of substrates include wood, plaster, metal, and drywall.

Title X—The Residential Lead-Based Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (Title X of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, Pub. L. 102–550).

Window trough—For a typical double-hung window, the portion of the exterior window sill between the interior window sill (or stool) and the frame of the storm window. If there is no storm window, the window trough is the area that receives both the upper and lower window sashes when they are both lowered. Sometimes (incorrectly) called the window ''well''.

Wipe Sampling for Settled Lead-Contaminated Dust—The collection of settled dust samples from surfaces to measure for the presence of lead. Samples must be analyzed by a laboratory recognized by the EPA's National Lead Laboratory Accreditation Program (NLLAP).

III. Application Selection Process

(A) Submitting Applications for Grants

To be considered for a research grant award, an original and two copies of the

application must be postmarked on or before the due date specified at the front of this NOFA. Electronic (fax or Internet) transmittal of the application is not an acceptable transmittal mode.

Applications must conform to the formatting guidelines specified in the application kit. The kit specifies the sections to be included in the application and provides related formatting and content guidelines.

The above-stated application deadline is firm. In the interest of fairness to all competing applicants, the Department will treat as ineligible for consideration any application that is received after the deadline. Applicants should take this factor into account and make early submission of their materials to avoid any risk of loss of eligibility brought about by unanticipated delays.

HUD will review each application to determine whether it meets the threshold criteria provided in section II.(A) of this NOFA. Applications that meet all of the threshold criteria will be eligible to be scored and ranked, based on the total number of points allocated for each of the rating factors described below in section III.(B). For an application to remain in consideration for funding, it must receive a total score of at least 65 points (out of a total of 100).

HUD intends to make awards to qualifying applications in the following order:

STEP 1 An award will be made to the highest ranked application in each of the four topic areas listed at sections I.(F)(1)(a) through (d) of this NOFA, within the limits of funding availability. If there are insufficient funds to award in all topic areas, HUD will make awards in topics (a) through (d) in rank order;

STEP 2 If funding remains available, an award will be made to the highest rank application in the ''other'' topic category listed at section I.(F)(1)(e) of this NOFA;

STEP 3 If funding remains available, an award will be made to the second highest ranked application in each of the four topic areas listed at sections I.(F)(1) (a) through (e) of this NOFA in rank order, within the limits of funding availability;

STEP 4 If funding remains available, awards will be made in rank order regardless of topic area.

Applicants may address more than one of the research topic areas within their proposal; however, each topic area will be rated and ranked separately. Also, projects need not address all of the objectives within a given topic area. While applicants will not be penalized for not addressing all of the specific objectives for a given topic area, if two applications for research in a given topic have equal scores, HUD will select the applicant whose project addresses the most objectives.

HUD encourages applicants to plan projects that can be completed over a relatively short time period (e.g., 12 to 18 months from the date of award) so that any useful information that is generated from the research can be available for policy or program decisions and be disseminated to the public as quickly as possible.

(B) Rating Factors

Rating Factor 1: Capacity of the Applicant and Relevant Organizational Experience (35 Points)

This factor addresses the extent to which the applicant has the ability and organizational resources necessary to successfully implement the proposed activities in a timely manner. The rating of the ''applicant'' will include any sub-grantees, consultants, sub-recipients, and members of consortia which are firmly committed to the project (generally, ''subordinate organizations''). In rating this factor HUD will consider the extent to which the application demonstrates:

(1) *The capability and qualifications of the principal investigator and key personnel* (20 points). Qualifications to carry out the proposed study as evidenced by academic background, relevant publications, and recent (within the past 10 years), relevant research experience. Publications and research experience are considered relevant if they required the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills that can be applied in the planning and execution of the research that is proposed under this NOFA.

(2) *Past performance of the research team in managing similar research* (15 points). Demonstrated ability to successfully manage the various aspects of a complex research study in such areas as logistics, research personnel management, data management, quality control, community research involvement (if applicable), and report writing, as well as overall success in project completion (i.e., on time and within budget). Applicants should also demonstrate that the project would have adequate administrative support, including clerical and specialized support in areas such as accounting and equipment maintenance.

Rating Factor 2: Need/Extent of the Problem (10 Points)

(1) The applicant must demonstrate responsiveness to solicitation objectives. The applicant should explain in detail the likelihood that the research would make a significant contribution towards achieving some or all of HUD's stated goals and objectives for one or more of the topic areas described in sections I.(F)(2)(a)-(d) of this NOFA.

(b) If the applicant is seeking funding for ''other'' research, as is described in section I.(F)(2)(e), the applicant must provide an explanation which demonstrates the importance and need for the research with respect to addressing the overall goal of this NOFA (see section I.(F)(1)).

Rating Factor 3: Soundness of Approach (45 Points)

This factor addresses the quality of the applicant's proposed research plan. Specific components include the following:

(1) *Soundness of the study design* (24 points). The study design must be thorough and feasible, and reflect the applicant's knowledge of the relevant scientific literature. Applicants should include a plan for analyzing and archiving data.

(2) *Project management plan* (7 points). The proposal should include a management plan that provides a schedule for the completion of major tasks and deliverables, with an indication that there will be adequate resources (e.g., personnel, financial) to successfully meet the proposed schedule.

(3) *Quality assurance mechanisms* (10 points). The applicant must describe the quality assurance mechanisms which will be integrated into the research design to ensure the validity and quality of the results. Areas to be addressed include acceptance criteria for data quality, procedures for selection of samples/sample sites, sample handling, measurement and analysis, and any standard/nonstandard quality assurance/control procedures to be followed. Refereed documents (e.g., government reports, peer-reviewed academic literature) which provide the basis for the quality assurance mechanisms should be cited.

(d) *Budget Proposal* (4 Points). The budget proposal should be thorough in the estimation of all applicable direct and indirect costs, and should be presented in a clear and coherent format (see application kit for required budget components).

The application will not be rated on the proposed cost; however, if two applications for a given topic area have equal scores, HUD will select the lowest cost application.

Rating Factor 4: Leveraging Resources (5 Points)

The extent to which the applicant can demonstrate that the effectiveness of the HUD research grant funds is being increased by securing other public and/or private resources or by structuring the research in a cost-effective manner, such as integrating the project into an existing research effort. Resources may include funding or in-kind contributions (such as services, facilities or equipment) allocated to the purpose(s) of the research. Staff in-kind contributions should be given a monetary value.

Applicants must provide evidence of leveraging/partnerships by including in the application letters of firm commitment, memoranda of understanding, or agreements to participate from those entities identified as partners in the application. Each letter of commitment, memorandum of understanding, or agreement to participate should include the organization's name, proposed level of commitment and responsibilities as they relate to the proposed program. The commitment must also be signed by an official of the organization legally able to make commitments on behalf of the organization.

Rating Factor 5: Comprehensiveness and Coordination (5 Points)

The applicant should describe how the results of the proposed research efforts can be applied by HUD or other programs to support planning, policy development, and/or public education in the area of residential lead hazard control.

(C) Court-Ordered Consideration

Due to an order of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, with respect to any application by the City of Dallas, Texas, for HUD funds, HUD shall consider the extent to which the strategies or plans in an application or applications submitted by the City of Dallas will be used to eradicate the vestiges of racial segregation in the Dallas Housing Authority's low income housing programs. The City of Dallas should address the effect, if any, that vestiges of racial segregation in Dallas Housing Authority's low income housing programs have on potential participants in the program covered by this NOFA, and identify proposed actions for remedying those vestiges. HUD may add up to 2 points to the score for any program based on this consideration. (This requirement is limited to applications submitted by the City of Dallas).

IV. Application Submission Requirements

(A) Applicant Data

Applications must be submitted in accordance with the format and instructions contained in the application kit. Informal, incomplete, or unsigned applications will not be considered. The following is a checklist of the application contents that will be included in the application kit:

(1) Completed Forms HUD–2880, Applicant/Recipient Disclosure/Update Report; Certification Regarding Lobbying; and SF–LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities, where applicable.

(2) Standard Forms SF–424, 424A, 424B, and other certifications and assurances listed in this NOFA.

(3) A detailed total budget with supporting cost justification for all budget categories of the Federal grant request (see application kit for details).

(4) An abstract containing the following information: The project title, the names and affiliations of all investigators, and a summary of the objectives, expected results, and study design described in the proposal. (See application kit for formatting instructions.)

(5) A description of the project. This description must not exceed fifteen (15) pages for each research topic area, including visual materials such as charts and graphs. A completed HUD Form 441.1 should also be submitted. (See application kit for format and required elements.)

(6) Any important attachments, appendices, references, or other relevant information may accompany the project description, but must not exceed ten (10) pages for the entire application.

(7) The resumes of the principal investigator and other key personnel. Resumes should be concise (i.e., no more than three pages) and limited to information that is relevant in assessing the qualifications of key personnel to conduct and/or manage the proposed research.

(8) Copy of State Clearing House Approval Notification (see application kit to determine if applicable).

(B) Certifications and Assurances

The following certifications and assurances are to be included in all applications:

(1) Compliance with all relevant State and Federal regulations regarding exposure to and proper disposal of hazardous materials .

(2) Compliance with relevant Federal civil rights laws and requirements (24 CFR 5.105(a)).

(3) Compliance with the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973;

(4) Assurance that financial management system meets the standards for fund control and accountability (24 CFR 84.21 or 24 CFR 85.20, as applicable);

(5) Assurance, to the extent possible and applicable, that any blood lead testing, blood lead level test results, and medical referral and follow-up will be conducted for children under six years of age according to the recommendations of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (See Appendix A of this NOFA—*Preventing Lead Poisoning in Young Children*);

(6) Assurance that HUD research grant funds will not replace existing resources dedicated to any ongoing project; and

(7) Certification of compliance with the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988 in accordance with the requirements set forth at 24 CFR part 24.

(8) Assurance that laboratory analysis is conducted by a laboratory accredited through the National Lead Laboratory Accreditation Program (NLLAP).

(9) Assurance that human research subjects will be protected from research risks in conformance with the Common Rule (Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, codified by HUD at 24 CFR part 60).

V. Corrections to Deficient Applications

After the application due date, HUD may not, consistent with 24 CFR part 4, subpart B, consider unsolicited information from an applicant. HUD may contact an applicant, however, to clarify an item in the application or to correct technical deficiencies. Applicants should note, however, that HUD may not seek clarification of items or responses that improve the substantive quality of the applicant's response to any eligibility or selection criterion. *Examples* of curable technical deficiencies include failure to submit the proper certifications or failure to submit an application containing an original signature by an authorized official. In each case, HUD will notify the applicant in writing by describing the clarification or technical deficiency. HUD will notify applicants by facsimile or by return receipt requested. Applicants must submit clarifications or corrections of technical deficiencies in accordance with the information provided by HUD within 14 calendar days of the date of receipt of the HUD notification. If the deficiency is not

corrected within this time period, HUD will reject the application as incomplete.

VI. Findings and Certifications

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

The information collection requirements contained in this NOFA have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520) and assigned OMB control number 2539–0011. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection displays a valid control number.

Environmental Review

This NOFA does not direct, provide for assistance or loan and mortgage insurance for, or otherwise govern or regulate, real property acquisition, disposition, leasing, rehabilitation, alteration, demolition, or new construction, or establish, revise or provide for standards for construction or construction materials, manufactured housing, or occupancy. Accordingly, under 24 CFR 50.19(c)(1), this NOFA is excluded from environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321).

Federalism Executive Order

The General Counsel, as the Designated Official under section 8(a) of Executive Order 12612, *Federalism*, has determined that the policies and procedures contained in this NOFA will not have substantial direct effects on States or their political subdivisions, or the relationship between the Federal government and the States, or the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Under this NOFA, grants or cooperative agreements will be made to support research activities which are anticipated to result in improvements in methods used to assess and mitigate residential lead hazards. Although the Department encourages States and local governments to conduct research in these areas, any such action by a State or local government is voluntary. Because action is not mandatory, the NOFA does not impinge upon the relationships between the Federal government and State and local governments, and the notice is not subject to review under the Order.

Section 102 of the HUD Reform Act; Documentation and Public Access Requirements

Section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545) (HUD Reform Act) and the regulations codified in 24 CFR part 4, subpart A, contain a number of provisions that are designed to ensure greater accountability and integrity in the provision of certain types of assistance administered by HUD. On January 14, 1992 (57 FR 1942), HUD published a notice that also provides information on the implementation of section 102. The documentation, public access, and disclosure requirements of section 102 apply to assistance awarded under this NOFA as follows:

(1) *Documentation and public access requirements.* HUD will ensure that documentation and other information regarding each application submitted pursuant to this NOFA are sufficient to indicate the basis upon which assistance was provided or denied. This material, including any letters of support, will be made available for public inspection for a 5-year period beginning not less than 30 days after the award of the assistance. Material will be made available in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and HUD's implementing regulations in 24 CFR part 15.

(2) *Disclosures.* HUD will make available to the public for 5 years all applicant disclosure reports (HUD Form 2880) submitted in connection with this NOFA. Update reports (also Form 2880) will be made available along with the applicant disclosure reports, but in no case for a period less than 3 years. All reports—both applicant disclosures and updates—will be made available in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and HUD's implementing regulations at 24 CFR part 15.

(3) *Publication of Recipients of HUD Funding.* HUD's regulations at 24 CFR 4.7 provide that HUD will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** on at least a quarterly basis to notify the public of all decisions made by the Department to provide:

(i) Assistance subject to section 102(a) of the HUD Reform Act; or

(ii) Assistance that is provided through grants or cooperative agreements on a discretionary (non-formula, non-demand) basis, but that is not provided on the basis of a competition.

Prohibition Against Lobbying Activities

Applicants for funding under this NOFA are subject to the provisions of section 319 of the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1991, 31 U.S.C. 1352 (the Byrd Amendment), which prohibits recipients of Federal contracts, grants, or loans from using appropriated funds for lobbying the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant, or loan. Applicants are required to certify, using the certification found at appendix A to 24 CFR part 87, that they will not, and have not, used appropriated funds for any prohibited lobbying activities. In addition, applicants must disclose, using Standard Form LLL, ''Disclosure of Lobbying Activities,'' any funds, other than Federally appropriated funds, that will be or have been used to influence Federal employees, members of Congress, and congressional staff regarding specific grants or contracts. Tribes and tribally designated housing entities (TDHEs) established by an Indian tribe as a result of the exercise of the tribe's sovereign power are excluded from coverage of the Byrd Amendment, but tribes and TDHEs established under State law are not excluded from the statute's coverage.

Procurement Standards

State and local government grantees are governed by and should consult 24 CFR 85.36 and 85.37, which implement OMB Circular A–102 and detail the procedures for subcontracts and sub-grants by States and local governments. Non-profit organizations are governed by 24 CFR 84.40–84.48, which implement OMB Circular A–110. Under OMB A–102 and A–110, small purchase procedures can be used for subcontracts up to $100,000, and require price or rate quotations from several sources (three is acceptable); above that threshold, more formal procedures are required. If States or local governments have more restrictive standards for contracts and grants, the State or local government standards can be applied. All grantees should consult and become familiar with either OMB A–102 or A–110, as appropriate, before issuing subcontracts or sub-grants.

Davis-Bacon Act

The Davis-Bacon Act does not apply to this program. However, if grant funds are used in conjunction with other Federal programs in which Davis-Bacon prevailing wage rates apply, then Davis-Bacon provisions would apply to the extent required under the other Federal programs.

Prohibition Against Advance Information on Funding Decisions—Section 103 of the Reform Act

HUD's regulations implementing section 103 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3537a), codified in 24 CFR part 4, apply to this funding competition. The regulations continue to apply until the announcement of the selection of successful applicants. HUD employees involved in the review of applications and in the making of funding decisions are limited by the regulations from providing advance information to any person (other than an authorized employee of HUD) concerning funding decisions, or from otherwise giving any applicant an unfair competitive advantage. Persons who apply for assistance in this competition should confine their inquiries to the subject areas permitted under 24 CFR part 4.

Applicants or employees who have ethics related questions should contact the HUD Ethics Law Division at (202) 708–3815. (This is not a toll-free number.) For HUD employees who have specific program questions, the employee should contact the appropriate field office counsel, or Headquarters counsel for the program to which the question pertains.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this program is 14.900.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4854 and 4854a.

Dated: May 20, 1998.

David E. Jacobs,

Director, Office of Lead Hazard Control.

Appendix A—Relevant Publications and Guidelines

To Secure Any Of The Documents Listed, Call The Listed Telephone Number (generally not toll-free).

Regulations

1. Worker Protection: OSHA publication—Telephone: 1–202–219–4667 (OSHA Regulations) (available for a charge)—Government Printing Office—Telephone: 202–512–1800 (not a toll-free number).

—General Industry Lead Standard, 29 CFR 1910.1025; (Document Number 869022001124)

—Lead Exposure in Construction, 29 CFR 1926.62, and appendices A, B, C, and D; (Document Number 869022001141)

2. Waste Disposal: 40 CFR parts 260–268 (EPA regulations) (available for a charge)—Telephone 1–800–424–9346, or, from the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, 1–703–412–9810 (not a toll-free number).

3. Lead; Requirements for Lead-Based Paint Activities in Target Housing and Child-Occupied Facilities; Final Rule: 40 CFR part 745, subparts L and Q (EPA) (State Certification and Accreditation Program for those engaged in lead-based paint activities)—Telephone: 1–202–554–1404 (Toxic Substances Control Act Hotline) (not a toll-free number).

4. Requirements for Notification, Evaluation and Reduction of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Federally Owned Residential Property and Housing Receiving Federal Assistance; Proposed Rule: 24 CFR parts 35, 36 and 37 (HUD)—Telephone: 1–202–755–1785 (Office of Lead Hazard Control) (not a toll-free number).

Guidelines

1. Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing; HUD, June 1995 (available for a charge)—Telephone: 1–800–245–2691:

Post-lead hazard control clearance, no more than:

100 Micrograms/sq.ft. (Bare and carpeted floors)

500 Micrograms/sq.ft. (Window sills)

800 Micrograms/sq.ft. (Window troughs (wells), exterior concrete and other rough surfaces)

2. Preventing Lead Poisoning In Young Children; Centers for Disease Control, October 1991: Telephone: 1–770–488–7330 (not a toll-free number).

3. Screening Young Children for Lead Poisoning: Guidance for State and Local Public Health Officials, November 1997; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC): Telephone: 1–770–488–7330 (not a toll-free number).

Reports

1. Putting the Pieces Together: Controlling Lead Hazards in the Nation's Housing, (Summary and Full Report); HUD, July 1995 (available for a charge)—Telephone 1–800–245–2691.

2. Comprehensive and Workable Plan for the Abatement of Lead-Based Paint in Privately Owned Housing: Report to Congress; HUD, December 7, 1990 (available for a charge)—Telephone 1–800–245–2691.

3. A Field Test of Lead-Based Paint Testing Technologies: Summary Report (Summary also available); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, May 1995. EPA 747–R–95–002a (available at no charge)—Telephone 1–800–424–5323.

4. Urban Soil Lead Abatement Demonstration Project. EPA Integrated Report, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, April, 1996. EPA/600/P–93–001AF (available from National Technical Information Service (NTIS) for a charge)—Telephone 1–800–553–6847.

[FR Doc. 98–14364 Filed 5–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–01–P