

Federal health care program and private payor requirements, and claims development and submission processes? Are training instructors qualified to present the subject matter and experienced enough to field questions? When thorough compliance training is periodically conducted, employees receive the reinforcement they need to ensure an effective compliance program.

An open line of communication between the compliance officer and a provider's employees is equally important to the success of a compliance program. In today's intensive regulatory environment, the OIG believes that a provider cannot possibly have an effective compliance program if it receives minimal feedback from its employees regarding compliance matters. For instance, if a compliance officer does not receive appropriate inquiries from employees: Do policies and procedures fail to adequately guide employees to whom and when they should be communicating compliance matters? Do employees fear retaliation if they report misconduct? Are employees reporting issues not related to compliance through the wrong channels? Do employees have bad-faith, ulterior motives for reporting? Regardless of the means that a provider uses, whether it be telephone hotline, email, or suggestion boxes, employees should seek clarification from compliance staff in the event of any confusion or question dealing with compliance policies, practices, or procedures.

An effective compliance program should include guidance regarding disciplinary action for corporate officers, managers, health care professionals, and other employees who have failed to adhere to an organization's standards of conduct, Federal health care program requirements, or Federal or State laws. The number and caliber of disciplinary actions taken by an organization can be insightful. Have appropriate sanctions been applied to compliance misconduct? Are sanctions applied to all employees consistently, regardless of an employee's level in the corporate hierarchy? Have double-standards in discipline bred cynicism among employees? When disciplinary action is not taken seriously or applied haphazardly, such practices reflect poorly on senior management's commitment to foster compliance as well as the effectiveness of an organization's compliance program in general.

Another critical component of a successful compliance program is an ongoing monitoring and auditing

process. The extent and frequency of the audit function may vary depending on factors such as the size and available resources, prior history of noncompliance, and risk factors of a particular nursing facility. The hallmark of effective monitoring and auditing efforts is how an organization determines the parameters of its reviews. Do audits focus on all pertinent departments of an organization? Does an audit cover compliance with all applicable laws, as well as Federal and private payor requirements? Are results of past audits, pre-established baselines, or prior deficiencies reevaluated? Are the elements of the compliance program monitored? Are auditing techniques valid and conducted by objective reviewers? The extent and sincerity of an organization's efforts to confirm its compliance often proves to be a revealing determinant of a compliance program's effectiveness.

It is essential that the compliance officer or other management officials immediately investigate reports or reasonable indications of suspected noncompliance. If a material violation of applicable law or compliance program requirements has occurred, a provider must take decisive steps to correct the problem. Nursing facilities that do not thoroughly investigate misconduct leave themselves open to undiscovered problems. When a provider learns of certain issues, does it knowingly disregard associated legal exposure? Is there a correlation between deficiency identified and the corrective action necessary to remedy? Are isolated overpayment matters properly resolved through normal repayment channels? Is credible evidence of misconduct that may violate criminal, civil or administrative law promptly reported to the appropriate Federal and State authorities? If the process of responding to detected offenses is circumvented, such conduct would indicate an ineffective compliance program.

Documentation is the key to demonstrating the effectiveness of a nursing facility's compliance program. For example, documentation of the following should be maintained: audit results; logs of hotline calls and their resolution; corrective action plans; due diligence efforts regarding business transactions; records of employee training, including the number of training hours; disciplinary action; and modification and distribution of policies and procedures. Because the OIG encourages self-disclosure of overpayments and billing irregularities, maintaining a record of disclosures and refunds to the health care programs is

strongly endorsed. A documented practice of refunding of overpayments and self-disclosing incidents of non-compliance with Federal and private payor health care program requirements is powerful evidence of a meaningful compliance effort.

IV. Conclusion

Through this document, the OIG has attempted to provide a foundation for the process necessary to develop an effective and cost-efficient nursing facility compliance program. However, each program must be tailored to fit the needs and resources of a particular facility, depending upon its unique corporate structure, mission, and employee composition. The statutes, regulations, and guidelines of the Federal and State health insurance programs, as well as the policies and procedures of the private health plans, should be integrated into every nursing facility's compliance program.

The OIG recognizes that the health care industry in this country, which reaches millions of beneficiaries and expends about a trillion dollars annually, is constantly evolving. The time is right for nursing facilities to implement a strong voluntary health care compliance program. Compliance is a dynamic process that helps to ensure that nursing facilities and other health care providers are better able to fulfill their commitment to ethical behavior, as well as meet the changes and challenges being placed upon them by Congress and private insurers. Ultimately, it is the OIG's hope that a voluntarily created compliance program will enable nursing facilities to meet their goals, improve the quality of resident care, and substantially reduce fraud, waste, and abuse, as well as the cost of health care to Federal, State, and private health insurers.

Dated: October 22, 1999.

June Gibbs Brown,

Inspector General.

[FR Doc. 99-28094 Filed 10-28-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4150-04-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-4432-N-43]

Federal Property Suitable as Facilities To Assist the Homeless

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This Notice identifies unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus Federal property reviewed by HUD for suitability for possible use to assist the homeless.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clifford Taffet, room 7266, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20410; telephone (202) 708-1234; TTY number for the hearing- and speech-impaired (202) 708-2565 (these telephone numbers are not toll-free), or call the toll-free Title V information line at 1-800-927-7588.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 24 CFR part 581 and section 501 of the Steward B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411), as amended, HUD is publishing this Notice to identify Federal buildings and other real property that HUD has reviewed for suitability for use to assist the homeless. The properties were reviewed using information provided to HUD by Federal landholding agencies regarding unutilized and underutilized buildings and real property controlled by such agencies or by GSA regarding its inventory of excess or surplus Federal property. This Notice is also published in order to comply with the December 12, 1988 Court Order in *National Coalition for the Homeless v. Veterans Administration*, No. 88-2503-OG (D.D.C.).

Properties reviewed are listed in this Notice according to the following categories: Suitable/available, suitable/unavailable, suitable/to be excess, and unsuitable. The properties listed in the three suitable categories have been reviewed by the landholding agencies, and each agency has transmitted to HUD: (1) Its intention to make the property available for use to assist the homeless, (2) its intention to declare the property excess to the agency's needs, or (3) a statement of the reasons that the property cannot be declared excess or made available for use as facilities to assist the homeless.

Properties listed as suitable/available will be available exclusively for homeless use for a period of 60 days from the date of this Notice. Homeless assistance providers interested in any such property should send a written expression of interest to HHS, addressed to Brian Rooney, Division of Property Management, Program Support Center, HHS, room 5B-41, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857; (301) 443-2265. (This is not a toll-free number.) HHS will mail to the interested provider an application packet, which will include instructions for completing the application. In order to maximize the

opportunity to utilize a suitable property, providers should submit their written expressions of interest as soon as possible. For complete details concerning the processing of applications, the reader is encouraged to refer to the interim rule governing this program, 24 CFR part 581.

For properties listed as suitable/to be excess, that property may, if subsequently accepted as excess by GSA, be made available for use by the homeless in accordance with applicable law, subject to screening for other Federal use. At the appropriate time, HUD will publish the property in a Notice showing it as either suitable/available or suitable/unavailable.

For properties listed as suitable/unavailable, the landholding agency has decided that the property cannot be declared excess or made available for use to assist the homeless, and the property will not be available.

Properties listed as unsuitable will not be made available for any other purpose for 20 days from the date of this Notice. Homeless assistance providers interested in a review by HUD of the determination of unsuitability should call the toll free information line at 1-800-927-7588 for detailed instructions or write a letter to Clifford Taffet at the address listed at the beginning of this Notice. Included in the request for review should be the property address (including zip code), the date of publication in the **Federal Register**, the landholding agency, and the property number.

For more information regarding particular properties identified in this Notice (*i.e.*, acreage, floor plan, existing sanitary facilities, exact street address), providers should contact the appropriate landholding agencies at the following addresses: GSA: Mr. Brian K. Polly, Assistant Commission, General Services Administration, Office of Property Disposal, 18th and F Streets, NW, Washington, DC 20405; (202) 501-0052; NAVY: Mr. Charles C. Cocks, Department of the Navy, Director, Real Estate Policy Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Washington Navy Yard, 1322 Patterson Ave., SE, Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20374-5065; (202) 685-9200; (These are not toll-free numbers).

Dated: October 21, 1999.

Fred Karnas, Jr.,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Development.

TITLE V, FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM—FEDERAL REGISTER REPORT FOR 10/29/99

Suitable/Available Properties

Buildings (by State)

Illinois

Homewood Natl Guard Facility
1300 West 187th Street
Homewood Co: Cook IL 60430-
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54199940002
Status: Excess

Comment: 4 old barracks, 5 storage
bldgs., 1 guard house, need major
repairs

GSA Number: 5-D-IL-651

Wisconsin

Army Reserve Center
401 Fifth Street
Kewaunee Co: WI 54216-1838
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54199940004
Status: Excess

Comment: 2 admin. bldgs. (15,593 sq.
ft.), 1 garage (1325 sq. ft.), need
repairs

GSA Number: 1-D-WI-597

Land (by State)

Puerto Rico

Bahia Rear Range Light
Ocean Drive
Catano Co: PR 00632
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54199940003
Status: Excess

Comment: 0.167 w/skeletal tower,
fenced, aid to navigation

GSA Number: 1-T-PR-508

Unsuitable Properties

Buildings (by State)

New Hampshire

Bldg. 55
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard
Portsmouth Co: NH 03804-5000
Landholding Agency: Navy
Property Number: 77199940020
Status: Unutilized

Reason: Secured Area

Bldg. 150

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard
Portsmouth Co: NH 03804-5000
Landholding Agency: Navy
Property Number: 77199940021
Status: Unutilized

Reason: Secured Area

North Carolina

Bldg. 1649

Marine Corps Air Station
Cherry Point
Havelock Co: Craven NC 28533-
Landholding Agency: Navy
Property Number: 77199940022
Status: Excess
Reasons:
Secured Area
Extensive deterioration

[FR Doc. 99-28002 Filed 10-28-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4210-29-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Notice of Receipt of Applications for Permit

The following applicants have applied for a permit to conduct certain activities with endangered species. This notice is provided pursuant to Section 10(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, *as amended* (16 U.S.C. 1531, *et seq.*):

Applicant: Charles Dennis Anderson, Anaheim, CA, PRT-018310.

The applicant requests a permit to import the sport-hunted trophy of one male bontebok (*Damaliscus pygargus dorcas*) culled from a captive herd maintained under the management program of the Republic of South Africa, for the purpose of enhancement of the survival of the species.

Applicant: Charles Walker, Gardena, CA, PRT-018622.

The applicant requests a permit to import the sport-hunted trophy of one male bontebok (*Damaliscus pygargus dorcas*) culled from a captive herd maintained under the management program of the Republic of South Africa, for the purpose of enhancement of the survival of the species.

Applicant: Brent Worth Holley, College Station, TX, PRT-018662.

The applicant requests a permit to import the sport-hunted trophy of one male bontebok (*Damaliscus pygargus dorcas*) culled from a captive herd maintained program of the Republic of South Africa for the purposes of enhancement of the survival of the species.

Applicant: David D. Flygare, Excelsior, MN, PRT-018720.

The applicant requests a permit to import the sport-hunted trophy of one male bontebok (*Damaliscus pygargus dorcas*) culled from a captive herd maintained program of the Republic of South Africa for the purpose of enhancement of the survival of the species.

Applicant: Theron Dewey Harden Jr., Chipley, FL, PRT-018721.

The applicant requests a permit to import the sport-hunted trophy of one male bontebok (*Damaliscus pygargus dorcas*) culled from a captive herd maintained program of the Republic of South Africa for the purposes of enhancement of the survival of the species.

Applicant: Triple S Game Farm, Edmond, OK, PRT-017888.

The applicant requests a permit to import two male and two female captive bred Cabot's tragopan (*Tragopan caboti*) from the Department of Biology, Beijing Normal University, China for the purpose of propagation for the enhancement of the survival of the species.

The public is invited to comment on the following application for a permit to conduct certain activities with marine mammals. The application was submitted to satisfy requirements of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, *as amended* (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) and the regulations governing marine mammals (50 CFR 18).

Applicant: Harry S. Afflcek, Jr, San Antonio, TX, PRT-018704.

The applicant requests a permit to import a polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) sport-hunted from the McClintock Channel polar bear population, Northwest Territories, Canada for personal use.

Applicant: Marvin Vander Ark, Bryon Center, MI, PRT-018623.

The applicant requests a permit to import a polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) sport-hunted from the McClintock Channel polar bear population, Northwest Territories, Canada for personal use.

Written data or comments, requests for copies of the complete application, or requests for a public hearing on this application should be sent to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Management Authority, 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Room 700, Arlington, Virginia 22203, telephone 703/358-2104 or fax 703/358-2281 and must be received within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Anyone requesting a hearing should give specific reasons why a hearing would be appropriate. The holding of such a hearing is at the discretion of the Director.

Documents and other information submitted with these applications are available for review, *subject to the requirements of the Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act*, by any party who submits a written request for a copy of such documents to the following office within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Management Authority, 4401 North

Fairfax Drive, Room 700, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Phone: (703/358-2104); FAX: (703/358-2281).

Pamela Hall,

Acting Chief, Branch of Permits, Office of Management Authority.

[FR Doc. 99-28297 Filed 10-28-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

Fish and Wildlife Service

Central Valley Project Improvement Act, California

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (FPEIS). FES-99-36.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (as amended), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) as co-lead agencies have prepared an FPEIS for the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). The alternatives provide a variety of means for implementing the CVPIA. The FPEIS includes comments received on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS) and its supplement, and responses to these comments. Two appendices have been revised and errata sheets have been prepared for other appendices.

DATES: Reclamation and the Service will not make a decision on the proposed action until 30 days after release of the FPEIS. After the 30-day waiting period, Reclamation and the Service will complete a Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD will state the action that will be implemented and will discuss all factors leading to the decision.

ADDRESSES: For a copy of the FPEIS, contact Ms. Alisha Sterud, Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, MP-120, Sacramento CA 95825, telephone: (916) 978-5190. Copies of the original appendices which were not revised are also available.

See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for locations where copies of the FPEIS are available for public inspection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information contact Mr. Alan Candlish, Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, MP-120, Sacramento CA 95825, telephone: (916) 978-5190; or James McKevitt, Fish and Wildlife