received will be analyzed to determine the extent to which the collection should be modified prior to submission to OMB for review and approval. Comments submitted in response to this notice also will be summarized or included in the FDIC's requests to OMB for renewal of this collection. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Dated at Washington, D.C., this 26th day of March, 1999.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

Robert E. Feldman,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–7954 Filed 3–31–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6714–01–M

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Notice of Agreements, Filed, etc.

The Commission gives notice that it has requested that the parties to the below listed agreement provide additional information pursuant to section 6(d) of the Shipping Act of 1984, 46 U.S.C. app. §§ 1701 *et seq.* The Commission has determined that further information is necessary to evaluate the impact of the proposed agreement. This action prevents the agreement from becoming effective as originally scheduled.

Agreement No.: 202–011650.
Title: North Atlantic Agreement.
Parties:

A.P. Moller-Maersk Line
APL Limited
Atlantic Cargo Services
Atlantic Container Line AB
China Ocean Shipping (Group) Co.
DSR-Senator Lines
Hanjin Shipping Co., Ltd.
Hapag-Lloyd Container Line GmbH
Hyundai Merchant Marine Co., Ltd.
Independent Container Line Europe NV
Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd.
Lykes Lines Limited
Mediterranean Shipping Co., S.A.
Mexican Line Limited
Nippon Yusen Kaisha
Orient Overseas Container Line, Inc.
POL-Atlantic
P&O Nedlloyd Limited
Sea-Land Service, Inc.
Yangming Marine Transport Corp.

Dated: March 26, 1999.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Bryant L. VanBrakle,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–7951 Filed 3–31–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation

Notice Inviting Applications for New Award for Fiscal Year 1999

AGENCY: The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), DHHS.

ACTION: Announcement of the availability of funds and request for applications from States and large counties to determine the status of applicants and potential applicants to the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program, individuals and families entering the TANF caseload, and individuals and families who leave TANF.

SUMMARY: The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) announces the availability of funds and invites applications for research into the status of applicants and potential applicants to the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program, individuals and families entering the TANF caseload, and individuals and families who leave TANF. Approximately four to six States or large counties will receive funding that will enable them to monitor and conduct research into the progress of individuals who apply for TANF benefits and their families. ASPE is particularly interested in targeting those applicants who apply for cash assistance but are never enrolled because of non-financial eligibility requirements, participation in up-front job search or other diversion programs, or failure to complete the application process. Proposed studies of new entrants onto the TANF program and of individuals leaving welfare also will be given consideration. Research topics could fall into the broad categories of employment and earnings, participation in government assistance programs, and child and family well-being. Grant applicants may choose any method for their proposed studies, including the linking of administrative data, surveys, or other methods as appropriate. The funds could either support a newly designed project or could be used to add new data sources and analyses to an existing project.

CLOSING DATE: The deadline for submission of applications under this announcement is May 17, 1999.

MAILING ADDRESS: Application instructions and forms should be requested from and submitted to: Adrienne Little, Grants Officer, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services, Room 405F, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20201. Telephone: (202) 690–8794. Requests for forms and administrative questions will be accepted and responded to up to ten (10) working days prior to the closing date.

Copies of this program announcement and many of the required forms may also be obtained electronically at the ASPE World Wide Web Page: *http://aspe.hhs.gov*. You may fax your request to the attention of the Grants Officer at (202) 690–6518. Applications may not be faxed or submitted electronically.

The printed **Federal Register** notice is the only official program announcement. Although reasonable efforts are taken to assure that the files on the ASPE World Wide Web Page containing electronic copies of this program announcement are accurate and complete, they are provided for information only. The applicant bears sole responsibility to assure that the copy downloaded and/or printed from any other source is accurate and complete.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Administrative questions should be directed to the Grants Officer at the address or phone number listed above. Technical questions should be directed to Matthew Lyon, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services, Room 404E, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20201. Telephone: (202) 401–3953. Questions may be faxed to (202) 690–6562 or e-mailed to *mlyon@osaspe.dhhs.gov*.

Part I. Supplemental Information

Legislative Authority

This grant is authorized by section 1110 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1310) and awards will be made from funds appropriated under Pub.L. 105–277, Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 1999.

Eligible Applicants

Given the nature of the research involved, competition is open only to State agencies that administer TANF programs and to counties with total populations greater than 500,000 that administer TANF programs. Consortia of States and counties are also encouraged to apply, as long as their combined total populations exceed 500,000 and a single agency is identified as the lead to handle grant funds and sub-granting. Public or private nonprofit organizations, including universities and other institutions of higher education, may collaborate with States in submitting an application, but the principal Grantee will be the State. Private for-profit organizations may also apply jointly with States, with the recognition that grant funds may not be paid as profit to any recipient of a grant or subgrant.

The Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Part 92 defines a State as: ''Any of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality of a State exclusive of local governments. The term does not include any public and Indian housing agency under United States Housing Act of 1937.''

Available Funds

Approximately $1,200,000 is available from ASPE, in funds appropriated for fiscal year 1999. ASPE anticipates providing approximately four to six awards of between $200,000 and $250,000 each. If additional funding becomes available in fiscal years 1999 or 2000, further projects may be funded or some projects may receive second year funding. However, applications for funding under this announcement should describe projects that can be completely carried out with one year of funding at the above anticipated level.

Background

Welfare caseloads have declined precipitously in recent years. Since January 1993, the number of people receiving federally funded assistance under Title IV–A of the Social Security Act has fallen from 14.1 million to just under 8 million recipients, a reduction of 44 percent. This decline has occurred in response to the Administration's grants of Federal waivers to 43 States, the provisions of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Pub.L. 104–193), and the strong economy. In response to the demand from the public and policymakers, many studies have been and are currently being carried out to study the circumstances of the large numbers of people who have left welfare. There has been less attention, however, to applicants and potential applicants to TANF, some of whom are formally or informally diverted from receiving cash assistance.

ASPE is interested in focusing on applicants and potential applicants to TANF for a number of reasons. First, some of the reduction in the welfare rolls has likely been caused by the reduced number of individuals and families applying for and enrolling in TANF. Little is known about the economic and employment status of applicants who are diverted from receiving assistance by new policies or procedures, or the well-being of their children and families. Moreover, the Department of Health and Human Services has a particular policy interest in learning about the degree to which TANF applicants are aware of their potential eligibility for Medicaid and other programs and services that are important in helping families make a successful transition to work. The extent to which low-income families diverted from or leaving cash welfare programs are receiving health insurance from private or public sources should also inform efforts to reduce the number of uninsured families.

The studies funded under this announcement build on previous ASPE-sponsored data-linkage and research projects to study the outcomes of welfare reform. These include projects involving linking of administrative data, research on state diversion programs, and an earlier round of grants to States and large counties to study the outcomes of welfare reform.

In FY 1996 and 1997, ASPE awarded grants to five States and one county for the purpose of linking administrative databases from multiple programs in order to study the interactions between programs and the use of multiple sources of assistance by recipients. As a result of this funding, the Grantees have significantly increased their ability to conduct research using administrative data.

In FY 1997, ASPE and the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) sponsored a study by the Center for Health Policy Research at The George Washington University to examine State diversion policies and practices and the potential effects of formal and informal TANF diversion programs on recipients and on participation in other government programs, particularly Medicaid. The study found that States are using three major methods to formally divert applicants from entering cash assistance: lump sum payment programs, mandatory applicant job search, and policies encouraging the use of alternative resources. In addition, some potential applicants are informally diverted, or discouraged from applying for TANF at all by strict expectations placed on recipients. Both the interim report, released in August 1998, and the final report, to be released in March 1999, raise questions about whether TANF diversion policies may reduce access to Medicaid for many low-income individuals who may be unaware of their eligibility for Medicaid under Section 1931 of the Social Security Act. The final report also stresses the need to gather more information about the population diverted from TANF and other public assistance programs.

Finally, the projects funded on this announcement will build closely on the ongoing ASPE-funded grants to study welfare outcomes. In FY 1998, ASPE awarded approximately $2.9 million in grants to study the outcomes of welfare reform on individuals and families who leave the TANF program, who apply for cash welfare but are never enrolled because of non-financial eligibility requirements or diversion programs, and/or who appear to be eligible but are not enrolled. These grants were funded by money earmarked by Congress for crosscutting research on the outcomes of welfare reform and interagency transfers from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and the Administration for Children and Families.

Grants were awarded to ten States (including the District of Columbia), two counties, and one consortium of counties under the FY 1998 announcement. In addition, a grant was made to South Carolina under a different program announcement to conduct a similar study tracking welfare families. Families leaving welfare are being studied by all fourteen of the FY 1998 welfare outcome Grantees—Arizona, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, South Carolina, Washington, Wisconsin, Los Angeles County in California, Cuyahoga County in Ohio, and a consortium of three contiguous counties in the Bay Area of California (San Mateo, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara). Research topics vary among Grantees, but include: employment and earnings, other income supports, health insurance, child care, child well-being, barriers to self-sufficiency, insecurity/deprivation, and other topics. In addition, five of the fourteen Grantees (Florida, South Carolina, Washington, Wisconsin, and the San Mateo County consortia) are including analysis of individuals who have been formally or informally diverted from receiving welfare.

The Wisconsin study, for example, includes an applicant diversion study undertaken by the Institute for Research on Poverty (IRP) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. HHS funding has allowed IRP to expand a study of individuals applying for Wisconsin

Works (W–2) assistance in Milwaukee. The project focuses on three subgroups of applicants: (1) Those who request assistance and subsequently participate in the W–2 program; (2) those who request assistance but are determined to be ineligible for program participation; and, (3) those who request assistance, appear to be eligible, but do not participate in W–2. A six-month cohort of applicants is being tracked through a combination of linked administrative data (e..g, public assistance, quarterly earnings, child support, foster care, and mental health data) and two waves of surveys. In order to address the difficult issue of identifying and surveying individuals who never enroll in the program and thus may not be regularly entered in the state public assistance administrative database, IRP researchers are approaching individuals on the day that they apply for cash assistance, immediately after they have been screened for potential welfare eligibility and before they meet with employment specialists. By conducting in-person interviews with applicants while they are still in the welfare office, IRP hopes to achieve a response rate of 90 percent for the first wave of interviews and gather sufficient information to be able to locate respondents for a follow-up interview twelve months later. Analysis of the applicants will take place across a variety of sub-topics, including the local welfare office, respondent demographics, welfare status over the twelve months, prior welfare receipt, and receipt of any support services.

The study of applicants in San Mateo County, California, differs somewhat from the IRP study. San Mateo County is able to take advantage of California's Case Data System (CDS), which includes every TANF application that is initiated in the state. Researchers in San Mateo County and at the SPHERE Institute in Palo Alto are using this system both to link all applicants with other administrative databases and to draw their survey sample. Because the Case Data System includes all applications, and not just those individuals who received TANF, San Mateo County can study individuals who began the application process but were diverted, as well as individuals who leave TANF. The work plan calls for administrative data linkage and a two-wave survey, administered at six and twelve months after ''case closure'' (when either the applicant withdraws from the application process or the TANF recipient leaves the program).

Another approach to studying diversion is being taken in Florida, South Carolina, and Washington. In addition to studying individuals who complete their applications for welfare but do not enroll in the program, each of these states is using Food Stamps and/or Medicaid enrollment data to identify those individuals and their families that appear to be eligible for cash assistance but are not enrolled in TANF. These individuals will be tracked through administrative databases or, in some cases, studied through a combination of administrative data and surveys.

As stated above, all fourteen welfare outcomes Grantees receiving FY 1998 funding are analyzing families that leave the TANF program. Each of the ''leavers'' studies includes at least two cohorts: one for which administrative data is retrieved and the other for which the Grantee compiles both administrative and survey data. The most common administrative data sets being used are public assistance data (TANF, Medicaid, Food Stamps, etc.) and wage data (usually Unemployment Insurance). Several of the Grantees also are using child welfare, child support, child care, JOBS or JOBS successor, and other human services data sets.

To supplement the information gathered through data linking, all 1998 Grantees are surveying at least one cohort of leavers. Most surveys are mixed mode (telephone interviews with an in-person follow-up when necessary), and most of the Grantees have acknowledged that a response rate of at least 70 to 80 percent is needed to avoid potential biases of their studies' results. Grantees are each developing their own survey instruments, generally drawing items from national surveys developed by the Census Bureau (e.g., the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), the Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD), the Food Insecurity Module used on the Current Population Survey (CPS)), other national surveys, existing state instruments (e.g., a survey used in an early South Carolina study of welfare leavers), and items developed by their own researchers. Variation across the Grantees exists in terms of the timing of cohorts, administrative data sets, and survey instruments. However, the Grantees have come to agreement on certain issues, including a common definition of ''leavers'' as individuals who leave cash assistance for a period of two months or longer.

Part II. Purpose and Responsibilities

Purpose

The purpose of this announcement is to support the efforts of States and large counties to research the circumstances of applicants and potential applicants to the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program, individuals and families entering the TANF caseload, and individuals and families who leave TANF. ASPE is committed to using the research funds appropriated by Congress to help build state and local capacity to conduct studies of the outcomes of welfare reform. Through these grants, ASPE hopes to support State efforts to gather a variety of information about the above individuals and their families, including their economic and non-economic well-being and participation in government programs.

More specifically, ASPE hopes to learn what happens to families who apply for welfare but are formally or informally diverted before enrollment. How are such families faring economically and in other measures of well-being? To what extent are such families still participating in Medicaid, Food Stamp, and child support programs (and if not, why not)? Similar questions can be asked about individuals and families who have left TANF. Finally, a study of TANF entrants provides still another perspective from which to analyze the outcomes of welfare reform.

A proposed study should include at least one cohort of applicants/potential applicants (with an emphasis on those formally or informally diverted from receiving cash assistance), entrants, or leavers. The Grantee has the option of studying just one of these types of populations, or of studying two or more. However, preference will be given to those Grantees that include a study of applicants and potential applicants to TANF, including diverted individuals and families.

The Grantee should clearly identify how the study population is defined. For example, applicants and potential applicants could include one or more of the following groups, as defined by the Grantee:

- individuals participating in a State or county's formal diversion program (lump-sum payment, mandatory applicant job search, and/or alternative resources),
- individuals that begin the application process but fail to complete it,
- individuals that complete the process and are determined to be eligible for cash assistance, but who withdraw from the program before receiving any benefits, and
- individuals who apply for cash assistance but are determined to be ineligible based on non-financial requirements.

Grantees studying individuals and families that leave TANF are encouraged to use the ''leaving cash assistance for two months or longer'' definition being used by the fourteen grantees funded in 1998. Grantees studying families that enter TANF should clearly define that population, and should explain how they will study the experiences of welfare entrants while they are enrolled in the TANF program.

Each Grantee will be expected to use administrative records from multiple programs and/or other data-gathering techniques to identify and conduct research into the experiences of the study population (as defined by the Grantee) over time. For example, applicants and potential applicants could be tracked through the application process, after eligibility is determined, and in subsequent months; former recipients and their families could be monitored after the point of closure; and entrants onto TANF could be studied throughout their participation in the program. An administrative data analysis could be enhanced through the use of retrospective data (i.e., prior welfare receipt, employment history), as well as data on characteristics at the time of cohort identification (point of application, case entry, or case closure) and over subsequent months.

Applicants for the ASPE grants may propose to augment their administrative data by linking individual records with survey data or other data sources. For example, surveys of applicants and those that have been diverted from applying can determine the individual's perceptions of the application process and reasoning for participating or not participating in different benefit programs. The combination of linked administrative data sets and surveys provide researchers with the answers to a wide range of research questions. Another possible enrichment of the data might involve providing contextual information by briefly documenting or describing the application process facing TANF applicants in the county or State studied (or the case closure procedures, if appropriate). This might include the role of the TANF agency in ensuring that applicants for cash assistance are enrolled into the Medicaid, Food Stamps, and Child Support Enforcement programs, where appropriate. The richness of the data the Grantee is able to provide will be an important criterion under which proposals are evaluated.

Studies of applicants, entrants, and leavers will benefit from tracking individuals and families over time. To this end, applicants may submit proposals for studies lasting up to seventeen months from the date the grant is awarded. While ASPE will obligate funds for studies as lengthy as seventeen months, proposals that allot this maximum time period will receive no preference over shorter studies, including those that last the conventional twelve months. If additional funding becomes available in fiscal year 2000, some projects may be considered for second year funding, allowing for an even longer time frame.

ASPE understands that there is a great degree of variation in State programs, and in the amount and scope of data available to states. Grantees also will vary in their identification of a study population and in the types of subgroup analyses that can be conducted. Subgroup analyses contrasting different types of diverted cases (e.g., participants in formal diversion programs, nonparticipating eligible individuals and families, and those that are non-financially ineligible), different types of closed cases (e.g., because of earnings, sanctions, time limits), and special populations (e.g., the disabled, substance abusers) are of interest. ASPE also has a strong interest in studying urban and rural subgroups. Comparisons across other demographic characteristics, including race and age and number of children, would also be helpful.

Topical areas that applicants may wish to address, with examples of potential policy questions, are listed below, grouped in three general categories for ease of presentation. Given the diversity of expected proposals, it is highly unlikely that every applicant would be able to address all of the issues and policy questions. Further, while the list represents the topics that are most important to ASPE researchers and policymakers, the suggested questions are in no way meant to be exhaustive. However, we would expect that applicants for funding will cover each of these three broad areas in their applications. If prospective applicants have additional questions which they feel are relevant within the context of welfare reform, they are encouraged to raise them in their proposal. Please note that though many of the questions focus on TANF applicants and potential applicants, they may be suggestive of similar issues that could be investigated in studies that focus on TANF entrants or individuals and families that leave the TANF program. Again, richness of data is strongly encouraged and will be an important criterion under which proposals are evaluated.

1. Employment and Economic Well-being

- Employment and earnings: What is the employment status of individuals at time of application for welfare? At time of case closure? Six to twelve months later? What types of jobs are held? What level of wages do they receive and how much do they receive in total earnings? What sort of work schedules do they have? What, if any, employer-provided fringe benefits and training are available to them, including health insurance? What fringe benefits do they and their family members actually receive? If applicants/entrants/leavers are not employed, why not? What was the cause of the most recent job loss? How long between job loss and application for welfare?
- Household income: What is total household income? Does this income fall below the poverty threshold? Are there earnings or other income from other members of the applicant's household? What are the sources of this income? Do they include disability payments? What financial support do they receive from extended family members or friends that live outside of the household?
- Child support: Do families have child support orders? Do they receive regular child support payments? If so, what proportion of family income does child support income represent? Is there evidence that the non-custodial parent provides some financial support, including in-kind goods and services, even if there is no ''formal'' child support?
- Barriers to self-sufficiency: Do applicants appear to face any barriers to employment, including disability, illiteracy, limited English proficiency, domestic violence, mental illness, or substance abuse? Are barriers to employment identified at time of application and do they influence the applicants' placement or ability to participate in an up-front job search or other component to a work-based approach to welfare (see also Child care section below)?

2. Participation in Government Programs

- TANF: What types of families are placed in formal diversion programs and for what reason? What types of families are eligible but do not enroll? What families are enrolled? Are there differences in the experiences of single and two-parent families? What are patterns of prior receipt for TANF applicants? For individuals leaving TANF, what are the reasons for closure (as identified in case records and reported by recipient)? How many families return to welfare, when, and why? For individuals entering TANF, what is their experience while receiving cash assistance? What services are they receiving, and how has their participation in the TANF program affected their ability to become self-sufficient?

• Medicaid and other health insurance: Are individuals and/or their children enrolled in Medicaid? To what extent are individuals aware of the eligibility guidelines and application procedures for Medicaid for themselves and/or their children? What information or guidance have they received from the State or local TANF or Medicaid agency? From other agencies or from health providers? Are applications for Medicaid routinely accepted and processed, even as applicants cooperate with work-search requirements to become eligible for TANF? Do adults and children in families have access to other health insurance, and if so, from what source? Are premiums or co-payments required? Are respondents aware of their children's potential eligibility for health coverage under the Children's Health Insurance Plan (CHIP)? Are those that are working aware of how to qualify for potential Transitional Medicaid benefits?

• Food Stamps: Do some or all family members participate in the Food Stamp program? To what extent are individuals aware of their potential eligibility for Food Stamps and of the application procedures? What information or guidance have they received from State or local agencies? Are Food Stamp applications processed, even as applicants cooperate with work-search requirements to become eligible for TANF?

• Child care: What child care arrangements are being used by families when parents are working, seeking work, or in employment and training programs? Does the family make any payments? Does the government or anyone else help pay for the child care? To what extent are families aware of their potential eligibility for child care subsidies and/or transitional child care, and of the application procedures? Did individuals lose any work because of child care problems, or conversely, lose child care due to work requirements? Do individuals require care for their children during non-traditional hours, such as weekends and after-school?

• Child Support Enforcement: Are all families, including those that are diverted from cash assistance, referred to Child Support Enforcement services? How are families that do not receive cash assistance treated by the Child Support Enforcement agency, as compared with TANF families (e.g., application fees, longer processing period, receipt of awards)? Are non-custodial parents being made aware of services that may be available to them?

• SSI and other government programs: Are TANF applicants referred to Supplemental Security Income (SSI)? What happens to applicants during the waiting period between referral and determination of SSI eligibility? To what extent are TANF applicants referred to and/or relying on other government programs, such as Unemployment Insurance, housing subsidies, free or reduced price school meals, WIC, and Head Start? Are applicants also referred to programs run by state and local governments or not-for-profit agencies?

• Attitudes: What are the attitudes of applicants, recipients, and former recipients toward the TANF application process, applicant job search and other diversion programs, TANF, work, and their current situation?

3. Family Well-being

• Food insecurity: Does the family have enough food to eat? Does the family run out of money to buy food? Were any family members forced to turn to food pantries for meals? Did any adults in the family skip meals? Did any children?

• Health insecurity: What is the health status of each family member? Do they have difficulties accessing health care? Did family members not get care or postpone getting care when they needed it for financial reasons? Has the family been forced to access emergency services, and if so, have they been able to obtain the needed assistance?

• Housing insecurity: Have families been forced to double-up or move in with relatives? Does the family run out of money to pay the rent? Have they been evicted or recently experienced periods of homelessness? Have families stayed in homeless shelters for any period of time?

• Family support: To what extent do individuals turn to extended family members, friends, and informal resource networks for support (including, but not limited to, the financial support discussed in the section relating to economic well-being)? During the application process, are applicants encouraged to seek the support of family members and friends as a potential alternative to welfare?

• Household composition and child living arrangements: How does household composition change over time, and how is this related to entry onto and exit from welfare? Are there changes in marital status? Changes in the number of adults living in the household? Pregnancies and births? Do any children enter or exit from foster care programs? Do children move to and from care between parents, or by relatives other than parents (e.g., informal arrangements, formal kinship care programs, child-only TANF cases)? How often have families moved?

• Child well-being: What are child health status and access to health care (see also Medicaid section above)? How are children faring in school? In child care? To what extent are there signs of positive behaviors/activities or behavior problems? What is the incidence of child abuse or neglect (see also Barriers to self-sufficiency section above)? Are there signs of maternal depression? Is there non-resident parent involvement with the child/children? If so, what types of involvement exist (e.g. amount of contact, participation in school, church, or other community events)?

Grantee Responsibilities

1. Prior to completion of the final work plan, the Grantee shall meet with relevant federal personnel, other Grantees, and invited experts in Washington, D.C., to discuss the preliminary methodology and design of the research project. As part of this process, the Grantees will take part in a joint discussion of their proposed study designs and research questions, and receive technical assistance from ASPE staff. This will allow for knowledge sharing across the various projects, as well as encourage peer-to-peer contacts among each of the Grantees.

2. No later than ninety (90) days after the date of award, the Grantee shall submit an outline of progress to date, if any, and a final work plan that is based on and updates the work plan submitted in the original application.

3. A second meeting may be planned later in the grant period in Washington, D.C., to discuss preliminary findings and the format for the final report (for Grantees outside the Washington, D.C. area, this may take place by telephone).

4. After completing the analysis, the Grantee shall prepare a final report describing the results of the study, including the procedures and methodology used to conduct the analysis, the research questions answered, the knowledge and information gained from the project, and any barriers encountered in completing the project. A draft of this report shall be delivered to the Federal Project Officer no later than thirty (30) days before the completion of the project. After receiving comments on the draft report from the Federal Project Officer,

the Grantee shall deliver at least three (3) copies of a final report to the Grants Officer before the completion of the project. One of these copies must be unbound, suitable for photocopying; if only one is the original (has the original signature, is attached to a cover letter, etc.), it should not be this copy.

5. To encourage wider analysis, the Grantee shall make all data available to the research community. ASPE prefers that this result in a public-use data file. In preparing the public-use data file, data shall be edited as appropriate to ensure confidentiality of individuals. If the applicant feels that provision of a public-use data file is impossible, the application should explain why and should fully articulate how the applicant will make the data available to qualified researchers and to ASPE. In either case, the plan for data dissemination will be evaluated and scored during the evaluation of proposals.

ASPE Responsibilities

1. ASPE shall convene one to two meetings of Grantees, federal personnel, and relevant experts in the areas the Grantees choose to address. The first meeting will allow for technical assistance and peer-to-peer contacts before final research design decisions have been made, and will assure that data constructs meet some standard of validity. A second meeting may be held approximately eight to ten months into the grant period to allow Grantees to meet, discuss and assess their progress to date, and receive assistance with any problems that have arisen.

2. ASPE shall provide consultation and technical assistance in the planning and operation of grant activities.

3. ASPE shall assist in information exchange and the dissemination of reports to appropriate Federal, State, and local entities.

Part III. Application Preparation and Evaluation Criteria

This section contains information on the preparation of applications for submission under this announcement, the forms necessary for submission, and the evaluation criteria under which the applications will be reviewed. Potential grant applicants should read this section carefully in conjunction with the information provided above. The application must contain the required Federal forms, title page, table of contents, and sections listed below. All pages of the narrative should be numbered.

The application should include the following elements:

1. *Abstract:* A one page summary of the proposed project.

2. *Goals and objective of the project:* An overview that describes (1) the project; (2) the specific research questions to be investigated; (3) proposed accomplishments; and (4) knowledge and information to be gained from the project by the applicant, the government, and the research community. If the proposal builds on any current project, the application should describe how funding under this announcement will enhance, not substitute for, current State or local efforts. Applications from States and counties that received funding from ASPE under the FY 1998 welfare outcomes grants are not precluded from submitting proposals under this announcement, provided they are proposing a new line of research, and not simply a continuation or extension of their current project. However, such proposals will be graded only on the Evaluation Criteria listed below and will receive no preferential treatment during the award process.

3. *Methodology and Design:* Provide a description and justification of how the proposed research project will be implemented, including methodologies, chosen approach, definition of study populations, data sources, and a research plan consistent with a descriptive, tabular analysis. The proposed research plan should:

(a) describe in detail how the applicant plans to define the study population, which should include one or more of the following: applicants and potential applicants to the TANF program (with an emphasis on those diverted from receiving cash assistance), individuals and families entering the TANF caseload, and individuals and families who leave TANF. Applications that propose studies of TANF applicants should include a description of the TANF application process in the State or large county to be sampled. This will assist reviewers in understanding when and how the sample population will be chosen.

(b) identify how the proposed data sets and variables will be used by the Grantee to answer each of the research questions described in the proposal.

(c) identify important issues for which data currently are not available, and strategies for dealing with this lack of data when it pertains to the research questions in the proposal.

(d) describe in detail the methodology the applicant will use to extract samples of TANF applicants and potential applicants, individuals and families entering the TANF caseload, and recipients who leave TANF. Grant applicants are encouraged to use a full population sample, but at a minimum, a successful applicant will use a scientifically acceptable probability sampling method in which every sampling unit in the population has a known, non-zero chance to be included in the sample and a sample size large enough to make statistically reliable comparisons between planned subgroups. If, however, the grant applicant proposes to sample applicants and potential applicants that live in certain geographic regions or are subject to a particular set of diversion programs, they may propose a sampling plan that covers only those regions in question.

(e) if administrative data-linking is planned, describe the criteria for the selection of existing data sets, as well as the methods used to clean, standardize and link the case-level data from the different sources. Applicants should discuss thoroughly how they intend to match case records from different data sources, and the internal validity checks that will be used to ensure the accuracy of the matches. The architecture for the resulting data set should also be discussed in detail.

(f) if survey data collection is planned, identify and describe the methodology used to gather survey data. In particular, identify the sampling plan, the survey mode (e.g., telephone, in-person, mail), and the steps that will be taken to address any biases inherent in each. These should include steps planned to ensure a high response rate, such as a mixed mode design, multiple attempts to contact sample members, or incentive payments to respondents, and steps taken to analyze differences between respondents and non-respondents, such as comparisons through linked administrative data. Because of the importance of a high response rate in ensuring reliability, these procedures will be an important part of the evaluation of proposals. In addition, grant applicants are encouraged, but not required, to include a draft of their proposed survey instrument as a supplement to their application.

(g) if qualitative research such as focus groups or a qualitative description of the TANF application, enrollment, and closure policies and procedures are planned, the application should include a complete plan for data collection procedures and analysis. This plan should include an approach for reviewing written documents, identification of key informants, the composition of any proposed focus groups, planned discussion topics, a plan for summarizing and organizing the results, and the value that this part of the project will add to the final report. The application should demonstrate a familiarity with the difficulties and potential biases of qualitative research, and include plans to avoid or resolve them.

(h) identify the methodology the Grantee will use to analyze the data and organize the final report. Complex data analysis is neither expected nor preferred. Simple tabular analysis and descriptive statistics are appropriate. The description should include subgroup analyses planned, report organization and proposed tabulations, including table shells illustrating how the results will be presented. The application should explain how different data sources (e.g., data from administrative sources, survey data collection, other research) will be synthesized to enhance the proposed analyses.

To the extent that the analysis uses data on individuals from multiple, separate sources, such as administrative databases from several State agencies, the proposal should discuss measures taken to maintain confidentiality, as well as demonstrate that the Grantee has obtained authorized access to those data sources. The preferred form of proof is a signed interagency agreement with each of the relevant agencies/departments. Though not preferable, letters of support from the appropriate agencies are acceptable, provided that the letter clearly states that the proposing agency has the authorization to access and link all necessary data. Grant applicants must assure that the collected data will only be used for management and research purposes, and that all identifying information will be kept completely confidential, and should present the methods that will be used to ensure confidentiality of records and information once data are made available for research purposes.

4. *Experience, capacity, qualifications, and use of staff:* Briefly describe the grant applicant's organizational capabilities and experience in conducting pertinent research projects. If the proposal involves linking administrative databases from multiple programs, the proposal should detail the applicant's experience in conducting projects using linked administrative program data or identify key subcontractors with such experience. If the proposal involves survey work, the proposal should describe the applicant's experience in conducting relevant surveys or identify key subcontractors with such experience. Similarly, if the proposal involves qualitative data collection or analysis, the experience of the applicant or key subcontractors with this type of research and with these populations must be described in detail.

If the grant applicant plans to contract for any of the work (e.g., data-linking, survey design or administration, qualitative analysis), and the contractors have not been retained, the applicant should describe the process by which they will be selected. Identify the key staff who are expected to carry out the project and provide a résumé or curriculum vitae for each person. Provide a discussion of how key staff will contribute to the success of the project, including the percentage of each staff member's time that will be devoted to the project. Finally, applicants should demonstrate access to computer hardware and software for storing and analyzing the data necessary to complete this project.

5. *Work plan:* A work plan should be included which lists the start and end dates of the project, a time line which indicates the sequence of tasks necessary for the completion of the project, and the responsibilities of each of the key staff. The plan should identify the time commitments of key staff members in both absolute and percentage terms, including other projects and teaching or managerial responsibilities. Due to the complicated nature of the study of applicants and potential applicants for welfare, work plans with time lines of twelve to seventeen months will be accepted.

The work plan also should include plans for dissemination of the results of the study (e.g., articles in journals, presentations to State legislatures or at conferences). As noted above, ASPE prefers that the data be edited as appropriate for confidentiality and issued as a public-use data file. The work plan should detail how resulting data and analysis will be made available to qualified researchers and to ASPE. If the grant applicant believes that provision of a public-use file would be impossible, the application should explain why and should fully articulate how the applicant will make the data available to qualified researchers and to ASPE.

6. *Budget:* Grant applicants must submit a request for federal funds using Standard Form 424A and include a detailed breakdown of all Federal line items. A narrative explanation of the budget should be included that states clearly how the funds associated with this announcement will be used and describes the extent to which funds will be used for purposes that would not otherwise be incorporated within the project. The applicant should also document the level of funding from other sources and describe how these funds will be expended.

As noted above, all applicants must budget for two trips to the Washington, D.C., area, for at least two members of the research team. At the first meeting, Grantees will have the opportunity to meet, discuss their projects, and receive feedback from both the other Grantees and from ASPE staff and invited experts. The second meeting will be approximately eight to ten months into the grant period, and will provide Grantees with the ability to meet and discuss their progress to date, and assess and receive technical assistance with any problems that have arisen.

Review Process and Funding Information

Applications will initially be screened for compliance with the timeliness and completeness requirements. Three (3) copies of each application are required. One of these copies must be in an unbound format, suitable for copying. If only one of the copies is the original (i.e., carries the original signature and is accompanied by a cover letter) it should not be this copy. Applicants are encouraged to send an additional two (2) copies to ease processing, but the application will not be penalized if these extra copies are not included. The grant applicant's Standard Form 424 must be signed by a representative of the applicant who is authorized to act with full authority on behalf of the applicant.

A Federal review panel will review and score all applications submitted by the deadline date that meet the screening criteria (all information and documents as required by this announcement). The panel will use the evaluation criteria listed below to score each application. The panel results will be the primary element used by the ASPE when making funding decisions. The Department reserves the option to discuss applications with other Federal or State staff, specialists, experts and the general public. Comments from these sources, along with those of the reviewers, will be kept from inappropriate disclosure and may be considered in making an award decision.

As a result of this competition, between four and six grants of $200,000 to $250,000 each are expected to be made from funds appropriated for fiscal year 1999. Additional awards may be made depending on the policy relevance of proposals received and the available funding, including funds that may become available in fiscal years 1999 or 2000.

Reports

As noted in the Grantee Responsibilities, two substantive reports are required under the grant: a final work plan (due no later than ninety (90) days after the date of award), and a final report containing all results and analysis (draft version due no later than thirty (30) days before the end of the project and final version due at the conclusion of the project).

In addition, Grantees shall provide concise quarterly progress reports. The specific format and content for these reports will be provided by the Federal Project Officer.

State Single Point of Contact (E.O. No. 12372)

DHHS has determined that this program is not subject to Executive Order 12372, ''Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.'' Applicants are not required to seek intergovernmental review of their applications within the constraints of E.O. 12372.

Deadline for Submission of Applications

The closing date for submission of applications under this announcement is May 17, 1999. Hand-delivered applications will be accepted Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays, during the working hours of 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in the lobby of the Hubert H. Humphrey building, located at 200 Independence Avenue, SW in Washington, D.C. When hand-delivering an application, call (202) 690–8794 from the lobby for pick up. A staff person will be available to receive applications.

An application will be considered as having met the deadline if it is either received at, or hand-delivered to, the mailing address on or before May 17, 1999, or postmarked before midnight three days prior to May 17, 1999 and received in time to be considered during the competitive review process (within two weeks of the deadline).

When mailing applications, applicants are strongly advised to obtain a legibly dated receipt from the U.S. Postal Service or from a commercial carrier (such as UPS, Federal Express, etc.) as proof of mailing by the deadline date. If there is a question as to when an application was mailed, applicants will be asked to provide proof of mailing by the deadline date. If proof cannot be provided, the application will not be considered for funding. Private metered postmarks will not be accepted as proof of timely mailing. Applications which do not meet the deadline will be considered late applications and will not be considered or reviewed in the current competition. DHHS will send a letter to this effect to each late applicant.

DHHS reserves the right to extend the deadline for all proposals due to: (1) Natural disasters, such as floods, hurricanes, or earthquakes; (2) a widespread disruption of the mail; or, (3) if DHHS determines a deadline extension to be in the best interest of the Federal government. The Department will not waive or extend the deadline for any applicant unless the deadline is waived or extended for all applicants.

Application forms

Application instructions and forms should be requested from and submitted to: Adrienne Little, Grants Officer, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services, Room 405F, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20201. Telephone: (202) 690–8794. Requests for forms and questions (administrative and technical) will be accepted and responded to up to ten (10) working days prior to closing date of receipt of applications.

Copies of this program announcement and many of the required forms may also be obtained electronically at the ASPE World Wide Web Page: *http://aspe.hhs.gov.* You may fax your request to the attention of the Grants Officer at (202) 690–6518. Grant applications may not be faxed or submitted electronically.

The printed **Federal Register** notice is the only official program announcement. Although reasonable efforts are taken to assure that the files on the ASPE World Wide Web Page containing electronic copies of this program announcement are accurate and complete, they are provided for information only. The applicant bears sole responsibility to assure that the copy downloaded and/or printed from any other source is accurate and complete.

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

Length of application

In no case shall an application for the ASPE grant (excluding the résumés, appendices and other appropriate attachments) be longer than thirty (30) single-spaced pages. Applications should not be unduly elaborate, but should fully communicate the applicant's proposal to the reviewers.

Selection process and evaluation criteria

Selection of successful applicants will be based on the technical and financial criteria described in this announcement. Reviewers will determine the strengths and weaknesses of each application in terms of the evaluation criteria listed below, provide comments, and assign numerical scores. The review panel will prepare a summary of all applicant scores, strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations and submit it to the ASPE for final decisions on the award.

The point value following each criterion heading indicates the maximum numerical weight that each section will be given in the review process. An unacceptable rating on any individual criterion may render the application unacceptable. Consequently, grant applicants should take care to ensure that all criteria are fully addressed in the applications. Applicants are reminded that preference will be given to those proposals that include a study of TANF applicants and/or potential TANF applicants. Grant applications will be reviewed as follows:

1. *Goals, Objectives, and Potential Usefulness of the Analyses* (25 points). The potential usefulness of the objectives and how the anticipated results of the proposed project will advance policy knowledge and development. If the proposed project builds on previous work, the application should explain how. Applications will be judged on the quality and policy relevance of the proposed research questions, study populations, and analyses (including subgroup analyses).

2. *Quality and Soundness of Methodology and Design* (30 points). The appropriateness, soundness, and cost-effectiveness of the methodology, including the research design, selection of existing data sets, data gathering procedures, statistical techniques, and analytical strategies. Richness of policy-relevant data will be an important scoring factor in this criterion.

If analysis of linked administrative data is planned, a critical scoring element will be the proposal's discussion of the methods used to clean, standardize, and link the individual-level or case-level data from different sources, including any proposed links between administrative data and surveys. Applicants should thoroughly discuss how they intend to match case records from different data sources, what internal validity checks will ensure the accuracy of the matches, and the architecture for the resulting data set. Other design considerations include whether the applicant has already obtained authorization to obtain and use the data to be linked from State or local agencies, and how confidentiality of the records and information will be ensured. If applicants are unable to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of information included in the project, then it is highly unlikely that they will receive funding.

If surveys are planned, reviewers will also evaluate the methodology proposed to gather survey data. In particular, reviewers will evaluate the sampling plan, the survey mode (e.g., telephone, in-person, mail), and the steps that will be taken to address any biases inherent in each. This will include evaluating steps planned to ensure a high response rate, such as a mixed mode design, multiple attempts to contact sample members, or respondent payments, and steps planned to analyze differences between respondents and non-respondents, such as comparisons of linked administrative data. Because of the importance of a high response rate in ensuring reliability, these procedures will be an important part of the evaluation of proposals containing surveys.

If qualitative research such as focus groups or a qualitative description of the TANF application, enrollment and closure policies and procedures are planned, reviewers will evaluate the plan for data collection procedures and analysis, including the planned approach for reviewing written documents, identification of key informants, the composition of any proposed focus groups, planned discussion topics, a plan for summarizing and organizing the results, and the value that this part of the project is expected to add to the final report. The extent to which the application demonstrates a familiarity with the difficulties and potential biases of this approach, and plans to avoid or resolve them, will also be a scoring factor.

Reviewers also will evaluate the proposed data analysis, including the proposed tabulations and table shells, the planned organization of the final report, and the proposal's discussion of how different data sources (e.g., data from administrative sources, survey data collection, other research) will be synthesized to enhance the proposed analyses.

3. *Qualifications of Personnel and Organizational Capability.* (20 points). The qualifications of the project personnel for conducting the proposed research as evidenced by professional training and experience, and the capacity of the organization to provide the infrastructure and support necessary for the project. Reviewers will evaluate the principal investigator and staff on research experience and demonstrated research skills.

Proposals that involve linking of administrative data and assembling of large databases will be scored on the applicant's or subcontractor's experience with such linking efforts. Proposals that involve survey work will be evaluated in terms of the applicant's or subcontractor's experience in conducting relevant surveys, including experience in securing high response rates from welfare recipients or other low-income populations. Similarly, if the proposal involves qualitative data collection or analysis, it will be evaluated in terms of the experience of the applicant or key subcontractors with this type of research and with these populations. If the applicant plans to contract for any of the work (e.g., data-linking, survey design or administration, qualitative analysis), and the contractors have not been retained, reviewers will consider the process by which they will be selected.

Reviewers may consider references for work completed on prior research projects. Principal investigator and staff time commitments also will be a factor in the evaluation. Reviewers will rate the applicant's pledge and ability to work in collaboration with other scholars or organizations in search of similar goals. Reviewers also will evaluate the applicant's demonstrated capacity to work with a range of government agencies.

4. *Ability of the Work Plan and Budget to Successfully Achieve the Project's Objectives.* (20 points). Reviewers will examine if the work plan and budget are reasonable and sufficient to ensure timely implementation and completion of the study and whether the application demonstrates an adequate level of understanding by the applicant of the practical problems of conducting such a project. Adherence to the work plan is necessary in order to produce results in the time frame desired; demonstration of an applicant's ability to meet the schedule will therefore be an important part of this criterion. Reviewers will also examine the use of any additional funding and the role that funds provided under this announcement will play in the overall project.

The proposal should also discuss in detail how resulting data will be made available to qualified researchers and to ASPE. As noted above, ASPE prefers that the data be edited as appropriate for confidentiality and issued as a public-use data file. If the applicant believes that provision of a public-use file would be impossible, the application should explain why and should fully articulate how the applicant will make the data available to qualified researchers and to ASPE.

5. *Ability To Sustain Project After Funding* (5 points). One of the ASPE's goals is to help States and large counties build their capacity to study the outcomes of welfare reform. For projects requiring significant follow-up studies, especially those tracking applicants, potential applicants, and entrants, grant applicants should identify an ability to continue their studies after the funding period closes. To this end, reviewers will consider whether the proposal adequately addresses questions such as the following: What will happen to the linked administrative data sets after the project period expires? What agency(ies) will have responsibility for and jurisdiction over linked administrative data sets after they are created? Are there any sources of financial and staff support for maintaining the database? To what extent could the administrative data linkages performed on the cohort under study be duplicated for later cohorts? To what extent could additional data linkages be performed to follow the initial cohort for additional years?

Disposition of Applications

1. *Approval, disapproval, or deferral.* On the basis of the review of the application, the Assistant Secretary will either (a) approve the application as a whole or in part; (b) disapprove the application; or (c) defer action on the application for such reasons as lack of funds or a need for further review.

2. *Notification of disposition.* The Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation will notify the applicants of the disposition of their applications. If approved, a signed notification of the award will be sent to the business office named in the ASPE checklist.

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

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number is 93–239.

Components of a Complete Application

A complete application consists of the following items in this order:

1. Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form 424);
2. Budget Information—Non-construction Programs (Standard Form 424A);
3. Assurances—Non-construction Programs (Standard From 424B);
4. Table of Contents;
5. Budget Justification for Section B Budget Categories;
6. Proof of Non-profit Status, if appropriate;
7. Copy of the applicant's Approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement, if necessary;
8. Project Narrative Statement, organized in five sections, addressing the following topics (limited to thirty (30) single-spaced pages):
   (a) Abstract,
   (b) Goals, Objectives and Usefulness of the Project,
   (c) Methodology and design,
   (d) Background of the Personnel and Organizational Capabilities and
   (e) Work plan (timetable);
9. Any appendices or attachments;
10. Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace;
11. Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, or other Responsibility Matters;
12. Certification and, if necessary, Disclosure Regarding Lobbying;
13. Supplement to Section II—Key Personnel;
14. Application for Federal Assistance Checklist.

Dated: March 26, 1999.

Margaret A. Hamburg,

Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

[FR Doc. 99–8069 Filed 3–31–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4150–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

The Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office of Public Health and Science, Is Seeking a Partnership With a Not-for-Profit Organization To Coordinate Efforts in the Private Sector Related to the National Conference Launching Healthy People 2010

AGENCY: Office of Public Health and Science, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, DHHS.

ACTION: Notice of partnership initiative.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Title XVII of the Public Health Service Act, notice is hereby given that the Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office of Public Health and Science, is seeking a partnership with a not-for-profit organization to coordinate efforts in the private sector related to the national conference launching Healthy People 2010. Healthy People is a national initiative that sets decade-long targets for health improvement. It has been a major activity in ODPHP's mission since 1979, when the first Surgeon General's Report on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention was published. Healthy People 2000 has been adopted by 47 States and 70 percent of local health departments; it is used as a model by other countries. Healthy People 2010 will be official introduced through a national conference in January 2000. The goal of this partnership is to stimulate the engagement of private sector organizations in the conference and enlist their support for specific events related to the conference, such as satellite and Internet broadcasts, and for scholarships to permit community representatives to participate in the conference. Not-for-profit organizations with missions explicitly related to health but not associated with any single issue or activity and with experience mobilizing the private sector would be well positioned to lead this private-sector effort on behalf of the Healthy People 2010 conference.

Note: The partnership between ODPHP and the outside organization will be formalized through a Memorandum of Agreement that will be effective from the date of signing to March 31, 2000 and will not involve a grant or contract.

DATES: Effective date to receive consideration is the close of business April 30, 1999. Requests will meet the deadline if they are either (1) received on or before the deadline date; or (2) postmarked on or before the deadline date. Private metered postmarks will not be acceptable as proof of timely mailing. Hand delivered requests must be received by 5:00 pm on April 30, 1999. Requests that are received after the deadline date will be returned to the sender.

ADDRESSES: Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 200 Independence Avenue, SW, Suite 738G, Washington, DC 20201.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matthew Guidry, Ph.D., Senior Prevention Program Advisor, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Suite 738G, 200 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20201, 202–401–7780. The electronic mail address is: mguidry@osophs.dhhs.gov.

Dated: March 24, 1999.

Mary Jo Deering,

Acting Director, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion.

[FR Doc. 99–7950 Filed 3–31–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–17–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics: Meetings

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Department of Health and Human Services announces the following advisory committee meeting.

Name: National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics (NCVHS), Executive Subcommittee.

Times and Dates: 10:00 a.m.–5:30 p.m., April 21, 1999.

Place: Conference Room 405A, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Ave. S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201.

Status: Open.

Purpose: The Executive Subcommittee of the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistic (NCVHS) is scheduled to hold a meeting on Wednesday, April 21, 1999 in the Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Washington, DC. The NCVHS is the Department's statutory federal advisory committee on health data, privacy and health information policy. At the meeting, the Subcommittee plans to discuss NCVHS subcommittee and work group plans for 1999, review the status of committee projects, priorities and initiatives, and plan for the June 1999 meeting of the full committee. In addition, the Subcommittee is expected to review and finalize the NCVHS 1998 Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of HIPAA, as well as the report to the Secretary on NCVHS activities and accomplishments during 1996–1998.

All topics are tentative and subject to change. Please check the NCVHS website for a detailed agenda prior to the meeting.

Contact Person for More Information: Substantive information as well as a roster of committee members may be obtained by visiting the NCVHS website (http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/ncvhs), where an agenda will be posted prior to the meeting. You may also contact James Scanlon, NCVHS Executive Staff Director, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHHS, Room 440–D, Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20201, telephone (202) 690–7100, or Marjorie S. Greenberg, Executive Secretary, NCVHS, NCHS, CDC, Room 1100, Presidential Building, 6525 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, Maryland 20782, telephone (301) 436–4253.

Note: In the interest of security, the Department has instituted stringent procedures for entrance to the Hubert H. Humphrey Building by non-government employees. Thus, individuals without a