

Mailstop E-18, Atlanta, GA 30341-4146, telephone (770) 488-2751, Fax (770) 488-2777, Email address: ayw3@cdc.gov.

See also the CDC Home Page on the Internet for applicable forms: <http://www.cdc.gov>.

For program technical assistance, contact Rob Lyerla, Ph.D., Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Infectious Diseases, Division of Viral and Rickettsial Diseases, Hepatitis Branch, 1600 Clifton Rd N.E., Mailstop G37, Atlanta, GA 30333, Phone: 404-639-3048, E-mail address: rfl8@cdc.gov

To receive additional written information and to request an application kit, call 1-888-GRANTS4 (1-888 472-6874). You will be asked to leave your name and address and will be instructed to identify the Announcement number of interest.

Dated: February 12, 1999.

John L. Williams,

Director, Procurement and Grants Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

[FR Doc. 99-4093 Filed 2-18-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163-18-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

The Advisory Council for Elimination of Tuberculosis: Meeting

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) announces the following council meeting.

Name: Advisory Council for the Elimination of Tuberculosis (ACET).

Times and Dates: 8:30 a.m.-5 p.m., March 10, 1999. 8:30 a.m.-12 p.m., March 11, 1999.

Place: Corporate Square Office Park, Corporate Square Boulevard, Building 11, Room 1413, Atlanta, Georgia 30329.

Status: Open to the public, limited only by the space available. The meeting room accommodates approximately 100 people.

Purpose: This council advises and makes recommendations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Assistant Secretary for Health, and the Director, CDC, regarding the elimination of tuberculosis. Specifically, the Council makes recommendations regarding policies, strategies, objectives, and priorities; addresses the development and application of new technologies; and reviews the extent to which progress has been made toward eliminating tuberculosis.

Matters to be Discussed: Agenda items include revisiting the 1989 TB elimination strategic plan; discussion of combined

preparations of TB drugs; update on contact studies; and follow-up on TB vaccine issues. Agenda items are subject to change as priorities dictate.

Contact Person for More Information: Beth Wolfe, National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, NE, M/S E-07, Atlanta, Georgia 30333, telephone 404/639-8008.

The Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, has been delegated the authority to sign **Federal Register** Notices pertaining to announcements of meetings and other committee management activities, for both the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

Dated: February 11, 1999.

Carolyn J. Russell,

Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

[FR Doc. 99-4090 Filed 2-18-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163-18-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Administration for Children and Families (ACF)

[Program Announcement No. OCSE 99SIP-1]

Child Support Enforcement Demonstration and Special Projects—Special Improvement Projects

AGENCY: Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE), ACF, DHHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The OCSE invites eligible applicants to submit competitive grant applications for special improvement projects which further the national child support mission, vision, and goals which are: all children to have parentage established; all children in IV-D cases to have financial and medical orders; and all children in IV-D cases to receive financial and medical support. Applications will be screened and evaluated as indicated in this program announcement. Awards will be contingent on the outcome of the competition and the availability of funds.

DATES: The closing date for submission of applications is April 20, 1999. See Part IV of this announcement for more information on submitting applications.

ADDRESSES: Application kits (Forms 424, 424A-B; Certifications; and Administration for Children and Families Uniform Project Description [UPD]) containing the necessary forms and instructions to apply for a grant

under this program announcement are available from: Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement, Division of State and Local Assistance, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, 4th Floor, East Wing, Washington, DC 20447 (This is not the mailing ADDRESS for submission of applications, See Part IV, B.); or contact Jean Robinson, Program Analyst, phone (202) 401-5330, FAX (202) 401-5559; e-mail, jrobinson@acf.dhhs.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Administration for Children and Families (ACF), OCSE, Susan A. Greenblatt at (202) 401-4849, for specific questions regarding the application or program concerns regarding the announcement.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This program announcement consists of four parts:

Part I: Background—program purpose, program objectives, legislative authority, funding availability, and CFDA Number.

Part II: Project and Applicant Eligibility—eligible applicants, project priorities, and project and budget periods.

Part III: The Review Process—intergovernmental review, initial ACF screening, competitive review and evaluation criteria, and funding reconsideration.

Part IV: The Application—application development, and application submission.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13): Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 20 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and reviewing the collection of information.

The following information collections within this Program Announcement are approved under the following currently valid OMB control numbers: 424 (0348-0043); 424A (0348-0044); 424B (0348-0040); Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (0348-0046); Uniform Project Description (0970-0139 Expiration date 10/31/00).

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Part I. Background

A. Program Purpose and Objectives

To fund a number of special improvement projects which further the national child support mission to ensure that all children receive financial and

medical support from both parents and which advance the provisions of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA). PRWORA strengthens the ability of the Nation's child support program to collect support on behalf of children and families. The law also enables the testing of child support innovations to improve program performance. For FY 1999, we are looking for grants in the following priority areas:

- Foster collaboration between IV-D State agencies and partner entities and other states to improve interstate case processing.
- Assist Tribal governments to plan and provide Child Support Enforcement (CSE) services to Native Americans and to evaluate effective program procedures and strategies.
- Develop planning grants and random assignment demonstrations to assess effectiveness of child support assurance projects.

Specific design specifications for each of these priority areas are set forth under Part II.

OCSE is committed to helping States make measurable program improvements that will enhance the lives of children. In addition Special Improvement Projects will also be considered which do not fall into one of the specified priority areas but which are in furtherance of efforts under the Government Performance and Results Act (i.e. designing a performance based program), and furthering the goals of the national child support enforcement program—all children to have parentage established; all children in IV-D cases have financial and medical orders; and all children in IV-D cases receive financial and medical support) and advance the requirements of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA).

Applicants should understand that OCSE will not award grants for special improvement projects which (a) duplicate automated data processing and information retrieval system requirements/enhancements and associated tasks which are specified in PRWORA; or (b) which cover costs for routine activities which should be normally borne by the Federal match for the Child Support Program or by other Federal funding sources (e.g. adding staff positions to perform routine CSE tasks or providing substance abuse services;) OCSE also has the discretion not to award grants that duplicate existing demonstrations, special projects and/or contracts that cover similar project objectives and activities.

Proposals should be developed with these considerations in mind. Proposals and their accompanying budgets will be reviewed from this perspective.

B. Legislative Authority

Section 452(j), 42 U.S.C. 652(j) of the Social Security Act provides Federal funds for technical assistance, information dissemination and training of Federal and State staff, research and demonstration programs and special projects of regional or national significance relating to the operation of State child support enforcement programs.

Section 453 (42 U.S.C. 653) of the Social Security Act provides Federal funds to cover costs incurred for the operation of the Federal Parent Locator Service.

C. Availability of Funds

Approximately \$2 million is available for FY 1999 for all priority areas. Refer to each priority area for estimated number of projects and funding. All grant awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds. A non-Federal match is not required.

D. CFDA Number: 93.601—Child Support Enforcement

Demonstrations and Special Projects.

Part II. Applicant and Project Eligibility

A. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants for these special improvement project grants are State (including Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) Human Services Umbrella agencies, other State agencies (including State IV-D agencies), Tribes and Tribal Organizations, local public agencies (including IV-D agencies), nonprofit organizations, and consortia of State and/or local public agencies. The Federal OCSE will provide the State CSE agency the opportunity to comment on the merit of local CSE agency applications before final award. Given that the purpose of these projects is to improve child support enforcement programs, it is critical that applicants have the cooperation of IV-D agencies to operate these projects.

Preferences will be given to applicants representing CSE agencies and applicant organizations which have cooperative agreements with CSE agencies. All applications developed jointly by more than one agency organization must identify a single lead organization as the official applicant. The lead organization will be the recipient of the grant award.

Participating agencies and organizations can be included as co-participants, subgrantees, or

subcontractors with their written authorization.

B. Project Priorities

The following are the specified priority areas for special improvement projects for FY 1999.

Priority Area 1.01: Fostering Improved Interstate Case Processing

Purpose: The purpose of this solicitation is to assist States to demonstrate new and/or more effective methods, procedures and models to foster collaborative efforts between partner entities and states to improve interstate case processing.

2. Background and Information: The child support provisions of welfare reform require all States to adopt the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA) by January 1, 1998. UIFSA replaced the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act (URESA), which required states to reciprocate in the enforcement of duties of support. Since rules weren't uniform among States, it made the interstate enforcement of support difficult in many cases. Thus, UIFSA provides for uniform rules, procedures, and forms for interstate cases. OCSE has been working with states to implement UIFSA and has also developed standard Federal interstate CSE forms compatible with UIFSA.

OCSE organized forums across the country for representatives from the UIFSA and URESA states to discuss and develop consensus methods for implementing administrative enforcement, direct income withholding, discovery, long-arm, and paternity establishment in interstate cases. Subsequently, many states have managed to process interstate cases in an uniform manner. Although a great deal of progress has been made over the past couple of years, states are still facing many challenges in the implementation of UIFSA.

3. Design Elements in the Application: In order to foster collaboration to improve interstate case processing under UIFSA, OCSE is interested in projects which develop effective/innovative strategies that address one or more of the following key issues/areas:

- What types of specific collaborative initiatives/methods between the courts and IV-D agencies would assist in processing interstate cases more efficiently and what procedures could help them more effectively use available UIFSA remedies and associated forms? How are States ensuring that the required data elements are correctly secured from courts and reported to IV-

D agencies for transmission to the Federal Case Registry.

Too often IV-D agencies and the courts do not have procedures to notify each other when taking actions on interstate cases, resulting in duplicate efforts and delays. Thus, we want to identify collaborative initiatives/methods that help build communication, avoid duplicate efforts and delays in processing interstate cases.

- What are the benefits and pitfalls of using direct withholding under UIFSA compared to interstate income withholding from IV-D agency to IV-D agency in different States? What are solutions to any problems encountered? What happens if there's an obligor contest in a direct withholding case? Is abandoning the direct withholding the best solution or are there ways to resolve these issues through the IV-D agency in the employer State that preserves the direct withholding? What impact does direct income withholding have on other services required in a case? Does it work to do direct withholding and initiate an interstate IV-D case for other necessary enforcement action? In addition, what approaches are being used by IV-D agencies to encourage and foster employer cooperation of wage withholding for interstate cases? Currently, state IV-D agencies are educating employers on using Federally mandated forms for income withholding for their child support cases but more needs to be done to encourage employers' compliance for interstate cases.

- What are the more cost-effective methods/approaches for interstate service of process? Projects should demonstrate whether in-house, or privatization or another approach is more cost-effective and efficient for service of process in interstate cases.

- With respect to high volume automated enforcement in interstate cases under PRWORA, what are exemplary practices for integrating these requests from other states into the assisting State's own data matching and attachment of assets (such as for financial institutions data matches and levies) in instate cases? What is the best way to avoid making these cases full blown interstate IV-D cases while being able to provide the data match and seizure of assets in an automated way and to keep track of information required to be reported on these cases?

- How is the Federal Parent Locator System (FPLS) data being integrated into the basic business functions of child support enforcement (*i.e.*, intake, paternity establishment, order

establishment/modification, enforcement and collections) to improve these business functions? How are more effective interstate locate methods/processes being developed through this integration of FPLS data? How are these methods being implemented in an automated fashion? How are caseworkers being sold on the advantages of using "new" FPLS data?

- What approaches are being used by IV-D agencies to monitor results, measure progress and manage interstate case processing more efficiently? The wealth of data provided from the National Directory of New Hires and the Federal Case Registry must be organized and managed in order to track results and program benefits. What methods have been adopted by States for tracking outcomes of data matches and how have results been utilized to demonstrate program benefits (*i.e.*, program methodology, benefit calculation methodology, reports, management information process, and performance measurements).

- With respect to use of interstate forms for withholding, imposition of liens and issuance of administrative subpoenas under PRWORA, are there exemplary techniques for maximizing successful use of these tools in interstate cases? Are there potential problems that arise in their use and tested solutions to those problems?

- How can we ensure consistency in policy and procedures in cases affected by both the Family Violence Indicator and UIFSA section 312 (nondisclosure of information in exceptional circumstances) to ensure consistent decision-making for interstate cases? In the UIFSA process, tribunals order information not to be released where a finding has been made that the health, safety, or liberty of a party or child would be unreasonably put at risk by the disclosure of identifying information.

Whereas, with the Family Violence Indicator, a flag will be placed on a case by the State Case Registry where there is a protective order in place or where the State has reasonable evidence of domestic violence or child abuse and the disclosure of such information could be harmful to the custodial parent or the child of such parent. Projects should develop approaches to demonstrate how best to coordinate these different decision-making processes for interstate cases? Projects should identify the benefits/impact of the approach on States' case processing? In addition, how can we provide courts with sufficient information upon which to base their override decisions of the Family Violence Indicator? Currently in

the interstate context, one State will not know the basis for a decision of another State to flag a case with the Family Violence Indicator, and this lack of information may prove difficult for judges faced with requests to override the indicator.

4. Project and Budget Periods: Generally, project and budget periods for these projects will be up to 17 months. OCSE will consider projects up to 36 months, if unique circumstances warrant. If OCSE approves a project for a time period longer than 17 months, OCSE will provide funding in discrete 12-month increments, or "budget periods." Funding beyond the first 12-month budget period is not guaranteed. Rather, future funding will depend on the grantee's satisfactory performance and the availability of future appropriations.

5. Project Budget: It is estimated that there will be one to four grants awarded (ranging from \$300,000 to \$1 million) for a total of \$1.2 million, for this priority area.

Priority Area 1.02: Tribal Child Support Enforcement Services

Purpose: The purpose of this solicitation is to foster the development and improvement of child support enforcement programs on tribal reservations. We intend to obtain information regarding innovations in the effective delivery of child support enforcement services to Native American children and their parents for dissemination nationally.

2. Background and Information: The provision of title IV-D child support services on Tribal lands can be a challenge for both Native American custodial parents, noncustodial parents and their children who need support and for tribal governments and courts which have traditionally lacked funding for providing such services. Often, tribal sovereignty and a lack of jurisdiction have prevented States from providing such services on tribal lands.

There has been recent progress by a number of tribes who developed CSE programs, cooperative agreements with States, improved the ability of tribal courts to handle support cases, development and enactment of tribal child support, etc.

With the enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Congress gave the Secretary of Health and Human Services authority to prescribe regulations to provide direct IV-D funding to tribes.

OCSE wants to both build on previous efforts by furthering the development of tribal child support programs and

services and assist tribes who wish to prepare for the implementation of direct funding in the future.

3. Design Elements in the Application: Based on previous developments and pending availability of direct IV-D funding to tribes, OCSE wants to encourage further improvements to child support capabilities on Indian lands. Some examples of the areas where approaches may be focused include:

- Adding to existing capability of a tribal child support program, e.g., expanding services to all tribal members in need of services, wage/income withholding.

- Legislative Development and/or Enactment. Some tribes may need to establish a legal framework for the operation of a future child support program or if a model code is available, that code must be enacted by tribal councils.

- Training for program staff, tribal court judges. Implementation of newly enacted child support codes and establishment of services may include orientation and training for responsible officials and staff.

- Planning. Tribes may have enacted child support codes but need to plan implementation of a program that provides services. This might include looking at automated systems, identifying staff, shaping roles and responsibilities between organizations such as the support program and tribal courts.

- Cooperative Agreements/Building Partnerships. Again, formal relationships may need to be established between tribal courts and the child support staff. Tribes may want to explore agreements with state or local governments that have experience and capabilities such as training, automated systems, location, etc. Cooperation between State and tribal governments may be necessary for effective child support enforcement when cases involve more than one jurisdiction.

- Tribal Statewide or Regional Institutions. A tribe or tribes and/or an intertribal council or a regional council of tribes may wish to design a partnership demonstration addressing child support issues of common concern on an intrastate, statewide or regional basis.

- Privatization. States and tribes may seek to develop innovative approaches through contracts with third parties to provide IV-D services on Tribal lands.

Where a partnership is being proposed between one or more tribes, a regional tribal council and a tribe or a state and a tribe, include a letter of support/cooperation from an

appropriate official of the partnering entity/organization.

4. Project and Budget Periods: Generally, project and budget periods for these projects will be up to 17 months. OCSE will consider projects up to 36 months, if unique circumstances warrant. If OCSE approves a project for a time period longer than 17 months, OCSE will provide funding in discrete 12-month increments, or "budget periods." Funding beyond the first 12-month budget period is not guaranteed. Rather, future funding will depend on the grantee's satisfactory performance and the availability of future appropriations.

5. Project Budget: It is estimated that there will be three grants awarded for a total of \$150,000 for this priority area.

Priority Area 1.03: Child Support Assurance

1. Purpose: The purpose of this solicitation will be to obtain information on the feasibility of, and innovative methods of establishing a child support assurance program. We will be particularly interested in projects that will provide replicable models.

2. Background Information: The concept of child support assurance builds upon the basic tenets of child support enforcement. All parents who do not live with their children are expected to help provide for them. A child with a living, nonresident parent would be entitled to benefits equal to either the child support paid by the nonresident parent or a socially assured minimum payment, whichever was higher. If the obligor pays less than that amount, the difference would be made up, in this case, by the demonstration project.

3. Design Elements: Elements we would like to see included in proposals include, but are not limited to the following:

- Feasibility Study(ies): A number of factors would have an impact upon the possibility of sustaining a child support assurance project beyond a demonstration.

- For example, what would the net cost of such a program be? Would differences in State financing of their IV-D programs effect the funding/public support and/or perception of a child support assurance program?

- What type of training and/or administrative support is needed to implement child support assurance?

- What types of legislative and/or policy changes would be needed?

- Are there caseloads that, because of their compositions, would be better/not as well suited, for child support assurance demonstrations?

- How would child support assurance be best integrated into the changes that the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 made to the IV-D program?

- Demonstration Project(s): We are interested in demonstrations that would test a number of variables that could be included in a child support assurance program such as:

- What is the optimal assured benefit level? At what level is the benefit enough to serve as an incentive for families but not too much to be cost prohibitive for States? Typical benefit levels are amounts sufficient to raise a family above the poverty line, \$1,000—\$3,000 per child with increases for additional children.

- Should the benefit be a universal or means tested program? As originally conceived, child support assurance would be a universal program because it may serve as a greater incentive for obligors to work. On the other hand, means testing is one way to target public dollars to those in greatest need. We would be interested in demonstrations that test both hypotheses.

- What is the effect upon TANF rolls of a comprehensive child support assurance strategy? Does participation in a child support assurance program help to move families off of TANF to self-sufficiency?

- What types of requirements should there be for participating in a child support assurance project? Should participation be limited to parents participating and/or making progress in fatherhood programs, work programs, parenting classes, substance abuse/remedial education programs?

- Does participation in a child support assurance program serve as an incentive to work?

- What should be the impact of receipt of child support assurance when determining eligibility of other government programs including TANF?

4. Project and Budget Periods: The project period for this priority area is thirty-six months. The budget period will be for 12 months. Funding beyond the first 12-month budget period is not guaranteed. Rather, future funding will depend on the grantee's satisfactory performance and the availability of future appropriations.

5. Project Budget: It is estimated that \$250,000 will be available per year for this priority area. The number of grants to be awarded will depend upon the quality of the applications received.

Other: OCSE will target funding for projects which fall under the three priority areas described above. However, OCSE will also screen and evaluate smaller scale projects (up to

\$50,000 per project) to cover projects outside the scope of these priority areas, consistent with the legislative authority described under Part I.B., subject to the availability of funds. Eligible applicants should describe how the special improvement project will improve the effectiveness of the child support program and promote a new focus on results, service quality, management/organizational innovations, outreach or public satisfaction.

Applicants should understand that OCSE will not award grants for special improvement projects which a) duplicate automated data processing and information retrieval system requirements/enhancements and associated tasks which are specified in PRWORA; or b) which cover costs for routine activities which should be normally borne by the Federal match for the Child Support Program or by other Federal funding sources (e.g. adding staff positions to perform routine CSE tasks or providing substance abuse services;) OCSE also has the discretion not to award grants that duplicate existing demonstrations, special projects and/or contracts that cover similar project objectives and activities. The project and budget period will be up to 17 months. It is estimated that there will be up to eight grants to be awarded (up to \$50,000 each).

Part III: The Review Process

A. Intergovernmental Review

This program is covered under Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs," and 45 CFR Part 100, "Intergovernmental Review of Department of Health and Human Services Programs and Activities." Under the Order, States may design their own processes for reviewing and commenting on proposed Federal assistance under covered programs.

Note: State/territory participation in the intergovernmental review process does not signify applicant eligibility for financial assistance under a program, a potential applicant must meet the eligibility requirements of the program for which it is applying prior to submitting an application to its single point of contact (SPOC), if applicable, or to ACF.

As of November 20, 1998, the following jurisdictions have elected not to participate in the Executive Order process. Applicants from these jurisdictions or for projects administered by federally-recognized Indian Tribes need take no action in regard to E.O. 12372: Alabama, Alaska, American Samoa, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas,

Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington.

Although the jurisdictions listed above no longer participate in the process, entities which have met the eligibility criteria of the program may still apply for a grant even if a State, Territory, Commonwealth, etc. does not have a SPOC. All remaining jurisdictions participate in the Executive Order process and have established SPOCs. Applicants from participating jurisdictions should contact their SPOCs as soon as possible to alert them of the prospective applications and receive instructions.

Applicants must submit any required material to the SPOCs as soon as possible so that the program office can obtain and review SPOC comments as part of the award process. The applicant must indicate the date of this submittal (or the date of contact if no submittal is required) on the Standard Form 424, item 16a. Under 45 CFR 100.8(a)(2), a SPOC has 60 days from the application deadline to comment on proposed new or competing continuation awards.

SPOCs are encouraged to eliminate the submission of routine endorsements as official recommendations. Additionally, SPOCs are requested to clearly differentiate between mere advisory comments and those official State process recommendations which may trigger the "accommodate or explain" rule.

When comments are submitted directly to ACF, they should be addressed to: Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement, Office of Grants Management, Attention: Lionel Jay Adams, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., 4th Floor, West Wing, Washington, DC 20447.

A list of the Single Points of Contact for each State and Territory is included with the application materials for this program announcement.

B. Initial ACF Screening

Each application submitted under this program announcement will undergo a pre-review to determine that (1) the application was received by the closing date and submitted in accordance with the instructions in this announcement and (2) the applicant is eligible for funding.

It is necessary that applicants state specifically which priority area they are applying for. Applications will be screened for priority area appropriateness. If applications are

found to be inappropriate for the priority area in which are submitted, applicants will be contacted for verbal approval of redirection to a more appropriate priority area.

C. Competitive Review and Evaluation Criteria

Applications which pass the initial ACF screening will be evaluated and rated by an independent review panel on the basis of specific evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria were designed to assess the quality of a proposed project, and to determine the likelihood of its success. The evaluation criteria are closely related and are considered as a whole in judging the overall quality of an application. Points are awarded only to applications which are responsive to the evaluation criteria within the context of this program announcement. Proposed projects will be reviewed using the following evaluation criteria:

(1) Criterion I: Objectives and Need for Assistance (Maximum 25 points)

The application should demonstrate a thorough understanding and analysis of the problem(s) being addressed in the project, the need for assistance and the importance of addressing these problems in improving the effectiveness of the child support program. The applicant should describe how the project will address this problem(s) through implementation of changes, enhancements and innovative efforts and specifically, how this project will improve program results. The applicant should address one or more of the activities listed under the "Design Elements in the Application" described above for the specific priority area they are applying for (refer to Part II.B. Project Priorities). The applicant should identify the key goals and objectives of the project; describe the conceptual framework of its approach to resolve the identified problem(s); and provide a rationale for taking this approach as opposed to others.

(2) Criterion II: Approach (Maximum: 30 points)

A well thought-out and practical management and staffing plan is mandatory. The application should include a detailed management plan that includes time-lines and detailed budgetary information. The main concern in this criterion is that the applicant should demonstrate a clear idea of the project's goals, objectives, and tasks to be accomplished. The plan to accomplish the goals and tasks should be set forth in a logical framework. The plan should identify

what tasks are required of any contractors and specify their relevant qualifications to perform these tasks. Staff to be committed to the project (including supervisory and management staff) at the state and/or local levels must be identified by their role in the project along with their qualifications and areas of particular expertise. In addition, for any technical expertise obtained through a contract or subgrant, the desired technical expertise and skills of proposed positions should be specified in detail. The applicant should demonstrate that the skills needed to operate the project are either on board or can be obtained in a reasonable time.

(3) Criterion III: Evaluation (Maximum: 30 points)

The applicant should describe the cost effective methods which will be used to achieve the project goals and objectives; the specific results/products that will be achieved; how the success of this project can be measured and how the success of this project has broader application in furthering national child support initiatives and/or providing solutions that could be adapted by other states/jurisdictions. A discussion of data availability and outcome measures to be used should be included. Describe the collection and reporting system to be used. For applications under Priority Area 1.03—Child Support Assurance, a randomly assigned control group is preferred and applicants should describe the ongoing and retrospective evaluation of the project that will be used.

(4) Criterion IV: Budget and Budget Justification (Maximum 10 points)

The project costs need to be reasonable in relation to the identified tasks. A detailed budget (e.g., the staff required, equipment and facilities that would be leased or purchased) should be provided identifying all agency and other resources (i.e., state, community other program—TANF/Head Start) that will be committed to the project. Grant funds cannot be used for capital improvements or the purchase of land or buildings. Explain why this project's resource requirements cannot be met by the state/local agency's regular program operating budget.

(5) Criterion V: Preferences (Maximum 5 points)

Preference will be given to those grant applicants representing IV-D agencies and applicant organizations who have cooperative agreements with IV-D agencies.

D. Funding Reconsideration

After Federal funds are exhausted for this grant competition, applications which have been independently reviewed and ranked but have no final disposition (neither approved nor disapproved for funding) may again be considered for funding. Reconsideration may occur at any time funds become available within twelve (12) months following ranking. ACF does not select from multiple ranking lists for a program. Therefore, should a new competition be scheduled and applications remain ranked without final disposition, applicants are informed of their opportunity to reapply for the new competition, to the extent practical.

Part IV. The Application

A. Application Development

In order to be considered for a grant under this program announcement, an application must be submitted on the forms supplied and in the manner prescribed by ACF. Application materials including forms and instructions are available from the contact named under the **ADDRESSES** section in the preamble of this announcement. The length of the application, including the application forms and all attachments, should not exceed 20 pages. A page is a single-side of an 8½"×11" sheet of plain white paper. The narrative should be typed double-spaced on a single-side of an 8½"×11" plain white paper, with 1" margins on all sides. Applicants are requested not to send pamphlets, maps, brochures or other printed material along with their application as these are difficult to photocopy. These materials, if submitted, will not be included in the review process. Each page of the application will be counted (excluding required forms and certifications) to determine the total length.

The project description should include all the information requirements described in the specific evaluation criteria outlined in the program announcement under Part III.C. The Administration for Children and Families Uniform Project Description in the application kit provides general requirements for these evaluation criteria (i.e., Objectives and Need for Assistance; Approach; Evaluation; Budget and Budget Justification).

B. Application Submission

1. Mailed applications postmarked after the closing date will be classified as late and will not be considered in the competition.

2. Deadline. Mailed applications shall be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are either received on or before the deadline date or sent on or before the deadline date and received by ACF in time for the independent review to: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Grants Management, Office of Child Support Enforcement, Attention: Lionel Jay Adams, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., 4th Floor West, Washington, D.C. 20447.

APPLICANTS MUST ENSURE THAT A LEGIBLY DATED U.S. POSTAL SERVICE POSTMARK OR A LEGIBLY DATED, MACHINE-PRODUCED POSTMARK OF A COMMERCIAL MAIL SERVICE IS AFFIXED TO THE ENVELOPE/PACKAGE CONTAINING THE APPLICATION(S).

To be acceptable as proof of timely mailing, a postmark from a commercial mail service must include the logo/emblem of the commercial mail service company and must reflect the date the package was received by the commercial mail service company from the applicant. Private Metered postmarks shall not be acceptable as proof of timely mailing. (Applicants are cautioned that express/overnight mail services do not always deliver as agreed). EXPRESS/OVERNIGHT MAIL SERVICES SHOULD USE THE 901 D STREET ADDRESS INSTRUCTIONS AS SHOWN BELOW.

Applications handcarried by applicants, applicant couriers, or by other representatives of the applicant using express/overnight mail services, will be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are received on or before the deadline date, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., EST, addressed to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Attention: Lionel Jay Adams, Office of Grants Management, Office of Child Support Enforcement, and delivered at ACF Mailroom, 2nd Floor (near loading dock), Aerospace Building, 901 D Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20024, between Monday and Friday (excluding Federal holidays). The address must appear on the envelope/package containing the application. ACF cannot accommodate transmission of applications by fax or through other electronic media. Therefore, applications transmitted to ACF electronically will not be accepted regardless of date or time of submission and time of receipt.

3. Late applications. Applications that do not meet the criteria above are considered late applications. ACF shall notify each late applicant that its

application will not be considered in the current competition.

4. Extension of deadlines. ACF may extend an application deadline when circumstances such as acts of God (floods, hurricanes, etc.) occur, or when there are widespread disruption of the mail service, or in other rare cases. Determinations to extend or waive deadline requirements rest with ACF's Chief Grants Management Officer.

Dated: February 5, 1999.

David Gray Ross,

Commissioner, Office of Child Support Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 99-4143 Filed 2-18-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee; Notice of Meeting

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

This notice announces a forthcoming meeting of a public advisory committee of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The meeting will be open to the public.

Name of Committee: Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee.

General Function of the Committee: To provide advice and recommendations to the agency on FDA's regulatory issues.

Date and Time: The meeting will be held on March 11, 1999, 12:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Location: Food and Drug Administration, Bldg. 29, conference room 121, 8800 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, MD. This meeting will be held by telephone conference call. A speaker telephone will be provided in the conference room to allow public participation in the meeting.

Contact Person: Nancy T. Cherry or Denise H. Royster, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (HFM-71), Food and Drug Administration, 1401 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, or FDA Advisory Committee Information Line, 1-800-741-8138 (301-443-0572 in the Washington, DC area), code 12391. Please call the Information Line for up-to-date information on this meeting.

Agenda: This committee will complete recommendations pertaining to the influenza virus vaccine

formulation for the 1999 to 2000 influenza season.

Procedure: Interested persons may present data, information, or views, orally or in writing, on issues pending before the committee. Written submissions may be made to the contact person by March 4, 1999. Oral presentations from the public will be scheduled between approximately 1:45 p.m. and 2:45 p.m. Time allotted for each presentation may be limited. Those desiring to make formal oral presentations should notify the contact person before March 4, 1999, and submit a brief statement of the general nature of the evidence or arguments they wish to present, the names and addresses of proposed participants, and an indication of the approximate time requested to make their presentation.

Notice of this meeting is given under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. app. 2).

Dated: February 11, 1999.

Michael A. Friedman,

Deputy Commissioner for Operations.

[FR Doc. 99-4113 Filed 2-18-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-F

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Care Financing Administration

[Document Identifier: HCFA-2552]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Health Care Financing Administration, HHS.

In compliance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), Department of Health and Human Services, is publishing the following summary of proposed collections for public comment. Interested persons are invited to send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including any of the following subjects: (1) The necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

Type of Information Collection Request: Revision of a currently

approved collection; Title of Information Collection: Hospital and Hospital Health Care Complex Cost Report, 42 CFR 413.20 and 413.24; Form No.: HCFA-2552-96; Use: This form is required by statute and regulation for participation in the Medicare program. It is filed annually by providers of service participating in the Medicare program to determine final payment for Medicare. It is used by hospitals, rural health clinics, and federally qualified health centers. Frequency: Annually and daily; Affected Public: Business or other for-profit, Not-for profit institutions, and State, Local or Tribal government; Number of Respondents: 7,000; Total Annual Responses: 7,000; Total Annual Hours Requested: 4,599,000.

To obtain copies of the supporting statement and any related forms for the proposed paperwork collections referenced above, access HCFA's Web Site address at <http://www.hcfa.gov/regs/prdact95.htm>, or E-mail your request, including your address, phone number, OMB number, and HCFA document identifier, to Paperwork@hcfa.gov, or call the Reports Clearance Office on (410) 786-1326. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collections must be mailed within 30 days of this notice directly to the OMB desk officer: OMB Human Resources and Housing Branch, Attention: Allison Eydt, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: February 11, 1999.

John P. Burke III,

HCFA Reports Clearance Officer, HCFA Office of Information Services, Security and Standards Group, Division of HCFA Enterprise Standards.

[FR Doc. 99-4151 Filed 2-18-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4120-03-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request

In compliance with the requirement for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects (section 3506(c)(2)(A) of Title 44, United States Code, as amended by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-13), the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) publishes periodic summaries of