

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.846, Arthritis, Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases Research, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: August 26, 2005.

Anthony M. Coelho, Jr.,

Acting Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 05-17463 Filed 9-1-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases; Notice of Closed Meetings

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), notice is hereby given of the following meetings.

The meetings will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Special Emphasis Panel; Review of an Unsolicited P01.

Date: September 22, 2005.

Time: 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications and/or proposals.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Rockledge 6700, 6700B Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20817, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Cheryl P. Lapham, PhD, Scientific Review Administrator, Scientific Review Program, National Institutes of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, DEA/NIH/DHHS, 6700B Rockledge Drive, MSC 7616, Room 3127, Bethesda, MD 20892-7616, 301-402-4598, clapham@niaid.nih.gov.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Special Emphasis Panel; Minor H Antigens and Kidney Transplantation.

Date: September 23, 2005.

Time: 2 p.m. to 6 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Rockledge 6700, 6700B Rockledge Drive,

Bethesda, MD 20817, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Sujata Vijn, PhD, Scientific Review Administrator, Scientific Review Program, Division of Extramural Activities, NIAID/NIH/DHHS, 6700B Rockledge Drive, MSC 7616, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 594-0985, vijhs@niaid.nih.gov.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.955, Allergy, Immunology and Transplantation Research; 93.856, Microbiology and Infectious Diseases Research, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: August 25, 2005.

Anthony M. Coelho, Jr.,

Acting Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 05-17515 Filed 9-1-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of Refugee Resettlement

Final Notice for FY 2005 Formula Allocation for Targeted Assistance Grants to States for Services to Refugees

AGENCY: Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), ACF, HHS.

ACTION: Final notice of availability of allocations for FY 2005 targeted assistance grants to States for services to refugees¹ in local areas of high need.

[CFDA No. 93.584, Refugee and Entrant Assistance—Targeted Assistance Grants]

SUMMARY: This final notice announces the availability of funds and award procedures for FY 2005 Targeted Assistance Program (TAP) grants to States for services to refugees under the Refugee Resettlement Program (RRP). These grants are for service provision in localities with large refugee populations, high refugee concentrations, and where specific needs exist for supplementation of currently available resources.

¹ In addition to persons who meet all requirements of 45 CFR 400.43, "Requirements for documentation of refugee status," eligibility for targeted assistance includes refugees, asylees, Cuban and Haitian entrants, certain Amerasians from Viet Nam who are admitted to the U.S. as immigrants, certain Amerasians from Viet Nam who are U.S. citizens and victims of a severe form of trafficking who receive certification or eligibility letters from ORR, and certain other specified family members of trafficking victims. See Section II of this notice on "Authorization," and refer to 45 CFR 400.43 and the ORR State Letter #01-13 on the Trafficking Victims Protection Act dated May 3, 2001, as modified by ORR State Letter #02-01, January 4, 2002, and ORR State Letter #04-12, June 18, 2004. The term "refugee," used in this notice for convenience, is intended to encompass such additional persons who are eligible to participate in refugee program services, including the targeted assistance program.

Qualification of counties for eligibility for targeted assistance program grants is determined once every three years as stated in the FY 1999 Notice of Proposed Availability of Targeted Assistance Allocations to States which was published in the **Federal Register** on March 10, 1999 (64 FR 11927). The FY 2002-FY 2004 three-year project cycle has expired. FY 2005 is the year for the re-qualification of counties for the three-year project cycle, FY 2005, FY 2006, and FY 2007 for TAP funds. Qualifications of counties are based on the arrivals of refugees (see Footnote 1, eligible population) during the 5-year period from FY 2000 through FY 2004, and on the concentration of the arrivals population as a percentage of the general population. Counties that qualify for TAP FY 2005 funds on the basis of the most current 5-year population are listed in this proposed notice in Table 1, Table 2, Table 4, and Table 6.

Under this final notice, a total of 48 counties (Table 1) qualify for targeted assistance grants. Of these, 6 new counties (Table 2) qualify for targeted assistance grants, and 11 counties (Table 3) which previously received targeted assistance grants no longer qualify for targeted assistance program funding.

Application Deadline: Application deadline for targeted assistance program funding will be September 12, 2005. A full application is required this qualifying year, FY 2005. Six (6) new counties are eligible for targeted assistance. Counties that have received TAP funds in the past and will continue to qualify for TAP have not been required to submit a full application since FY 2002. Application requirements in the second and third of a 3-year project cycle will be less extensive.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathy Do, Division of Budget, Policy and Data Analysis (DBPDA), (202) 401-4579; e-mail: kdo@acf.hhs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Purpose and Scope

This final notice announces the availability of Fiscal Year 2005 funds for targeted assistance grants for services to refugees (see Footnote 1 for eligible population) in counties where, because of factors such as unusually large refugee populations and high refugee concentrations, there exists and can be demonstrated a specific need for supplementation of resources for services to this population.

The Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) has available \$49,081,000 in FY 2005 funds for the targeted assistance

program (TAP) as part of the FY 2005 appropriation under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005, (Pub. L. 108–447).

The Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) plans to use the \$49,081,000 in targeted assistance funds as follows:

- \$44,173,066 will be allocated to States under the 5-year population formula, as set forth in this final notice.
- \$4,907,934 (10% of the total) will be used to award discretionary grants to States under continuation grant awards.

The purpose of targeted assistance grants is to provide, through a process of local planning and implementation, direct services intended to result in the economic self-sufficiency and reduced welfare dependency of refugees through job placements.

The targeted assistance program reflects the requirements of section 412(c)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), which provides that targeted assistance grants shall be made available “(i) primarily for the purpose of facilitating refugee employment and achievement of self-sufficiency, (ii) in a manner that does not supplant other refugee program funds and that assures that not less than 95 percent of the amount of the grant award is made available to the county or other local entity.”

II. Authorization

Targeted assistance projects are funded under the authority of section 412(c)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended by the Refugee Assistance Extension Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99–605), 8 U.S.C. 1522(c)(2); section 501(a) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96–422), 8 U.S.C. 1522 note, insofar as it incorporates by reference with respect to Cuban and Haitian entrants the authorities pertaining to assistance for refugees established by section 412(c)(2) of the INA, as cited above; section 584(c) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988, as included in the FY 1988 Continuing Resolution (Pub. L. 100–202), insofar as it incorporates by reference with respect to certain Amerasians from Viet Nam the authorities pertaining to assistance for refugees established by section 412(c)(2) of the INA, as cited above, including certain Amerasians from Viet Nam who are U.S. citizens, as provided under title II of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Acts, 1989 (Pub. L. 100–461), 1990 (Pub. L. 101–167), and 1991 (Pub. L. 101–513); section 107(b)(1)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act

of 2000 (Pub. L. 106–386), and as amended by the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108–193), insofar as it states that a victim of a severe form of trafficking and certain other specified family members shall be eligible for federally funded or administered benefits and services to the same extent as a refugee.

III. Client and Service Priorities

Targeted assistance funding must be used to assist refugee families to achieve economic independence. To this end, States and counties are required to ensure that a coherent family self-sufficiency plan (FSSP), employment development plan (EDP), or individual employability plan (IEP) is developed for each eligible family that addresses the family's needs from time of arrival until attainment of economic independence. (See 45 CFR 400.79, 400.156(g), and 400.317). Each family self-sufficiency plan or employment development plan should address a family's needs for both employment-related services and other needed social services. The plan must include: (1) A determination of the income level a family would have to earn to exceed its cash grant and move into self-support without suffering a monetary penalty; (2) a strategy and timetable for obtaining that level of family income through the placement in employment of sufficient numbers of employable family members at sufficient wage levels; (3) employability plans for every employable member of the family; and (4) a plan to address the family's social services needs that may be barriers to self-sufficiency. In local jurisdictions that have targeted assistance and refugee social services programs, one family self-sufficiency plan may be developed for a family that incorporates both targeted assistance and refugee social services.

Services funded through the targeted assistance program are required to focus primarily on those refugees who, either because of their protracted use of public assistance or difficulty in securing employment, continue to need services beyond the initial years of resettlement. States may not provide services funded under this notice, except for referral and interpreter services, to refugees who have been in the United States for more than 60 months (5 years). (See 45 CFR 400.315).

In accordance with 45 CFR 400.314, States are required to provide targeted assistance services to refugees in the following order of priority, except in certain individual extreme circumstances: (a) Refugees who are

cash assistance recipients, particularly long-term recipients; (b) unemployed refugees who are not receiving cash assistance; and (c) employed refugees in need of services to retain employment or to attain economic independence.

In addition to the statutory requirement that TAP funds be used “primarily for the purpose of facilitating refugee employment” (section 412(c)(2)(B)(i) of the INA), funds awarded under this program are intended to help fulfill the congressional intent that “employable refugees should be placed on jobs as soon as possible after their arrival in the United States” (section 412(a)(1)(B)(i) of the INA). Therefore, in accordance with 45 CFR 400.313, targeted assistance funds must be used primarily for employability services designed to enable refugees to obtain jobs with less than one year's participation in the targeted assistance program in order to achieve economic self-sufficiency as soon as possible. Targeted assistance services may continue to be provided after a refugee has entered a job to help the refugee retain employment or move to a better job. Targeted assistance funds may not be used for long-term training programs such as vocational training that last for more than a year or educational programs that are not intended to lead to employment within a year.

In accordance with 45 CFR 400.317, if targeted assistance funds are used for the provision of English language training, such training must be provided in a concurrent, rather than sequential, time period with employment or with other employment-related activities.

A portion of a local area's allocation may be used for services that are not directed toward the achievement of a specific employment objective in less than one year but that are essential to the adjustment of refugees in the community, provided such needs are clearly demonstrated and such use is approved by the State. (See 45 CFR 400.316).

Reflecting section 412(a)(1)(A)(iv) of the INA, States must “ensure that women have the same opportunities as men to participate in training and instruction.” Additionally, in accordance with 45 CFR 400.317, services must be provided to the maximum extent feasible in a manner that includes the use of bilingual/bicultural women on service agency staff to ensure adequate service access by refugee women. The Director, ORR, also strongly encourages the inclusion of refugee women in management and board positions in agencies that serve refugees. In order to facilitate refugee

self-support, the Director also expects States to implement strategies which address simultaneously the employment potential of both male and female wage earners in a family unit. States and counties are expected to make every effort to obtain child care services, preferably subsidized child care, for children in order to allow women with children the opportunity to participate in employment services or to accept or retain employment. To accomplish this, child care may be treated as an employment-related service under the targeted assistance program. Refugees who are participating in targeted assistance-funded or social services-funded employment services or have accepted employment are eligible for child care services for their children. States and counties are expected to use child care funding from other publicly-administered programs such as child care services funded under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or under the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) as a primary resource. States and counties are encouraged to work with service providers to ensure mainstream access for refugees to other publicly funded resources for child care. For an employed refugee, targeted assistance-funded child care should be limited to situations in which no other publicly funded child care funding is available. In these cases, child care services funded by targeted assistance should be limited to one year after the refugee becomes employed.

In accordance with 45 CFR 400.317, targeted assistance services must be provided in a manner that is culturally and linguistically compatible with a refugee's language and cultural background, to the maximum extent feasible. In light of the increasingly diverse population of refugees who are resettling in this country, refugee service agencies will need to develop practical ways of providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to a changing ethnic population. Services funded under this notice must be refugee-specific services that are designed specifically to meet refugee needs and are in keeping with the rules and objectives of the refugee program. Short-term vocational or job-skills training, on-the-job training (OJT), or English language training (ELT), however, need not be refugee-specific.

ORR strongly encourages States and counties when contracting for targeted assistance services, including employment services, to give consideration to the special strengths of mutual assistance associations (MAAs), whenever contract bidders are otherwise

equally qualified, provided that the MAA has the capability to deliver services in a manner that is culturally and linguistically compatible with the background of the target population to be served. ORR also strongly encourages MAAs to ensure that their management and board composition reflect the major target populations to be served.

ORR defines MAAs as organizations with the following qualifications:

- a. The organization is legally incorporated as a nonprofit organization; and
- b. Not less than 51% of the composition of the Board of Directors or governing board of the mutual assistance association is comprised of refugees or former refugees, including both refugee men and women.

Finally, in order to provide culturally and linguistically compatible services in as cost-efficient a manner as possible in time of limited resources, ORR strongly encourages States and counties to promote and give special consideration to the provision of services through coalitions of refugee service organizations, such as coalitions of MAAs, voluntary resettlement agencies, or a variety of service providers. ORR believes it is essential for refugee-serving organizations to form close partnerships in the provision of services to refugees in order to be able to respond adequately to a changing refugee environment. States and counties are encouraged to consider as eligible for TAP funds entities that are public or private non-profit agencies which may include faith-based, refugee or community-based organizations. Additionally, coalition-building and consolidation of providers is particularly important in communities with multiple service providers in order to ensure better coordination of services and maximum use of funding for services by minimizing the funds used for multiple administrative overhead costs.

The award of funds to States under this final notice will be contingent upon the completeness of a State's application as described in section IX, below.

IV. Discussion of Comments Received

Five States submitted comments in response to the proposed notice of FY 2005 funds for targeted assistance. The comments are summarized below and are followed by ORR's response.

Comment: Two States submitted information requesting participation in the targeted assistance program.

Response: Of the two requesting States, one is found to have a county which ranked within the top 48 counties qualified for targeted assistance

funds, therefore, the State is included in this qualifying project cycle (FY 2005—FY 2007). County data (refugees, asylees, and secondary migrants) submitted by the other State failed to make the cut-off point. The county is ranked number 62. Data on secondary migrants is not considered for targeted assistance population count due to the improbable task of tracking in-migration and out-migration for all targeted assistance counties nationwide in order to arrive at adjusted population estimates.

Comment: Two States requested reconsideration of their counties due to unprecedented new arrivals of secondary migration of refugees.

Response: As stated in the above response, data on secondary migration is not considered for targeted assistance population count.

Comment: One State requested reconsideration of one of its counties which was eliminated in this qualifying cycle.

Response: ORR conducted the final re-allocation task taking into account all eligibility factors which are outlined in the statute for which data are available. The said county ranked number 69 on the list.

ORR understands that discontinuing funding in the counties that no longer qualify for TAP will undoubtedly have an effect on the services in those counties. However, funds must be directed to those counties that are most impacted by recent arrivals as required by statute.

V. Eligible Grantees

Eligible grantees are: 1. Agencies of State governments that are responsible for the refugee program under 45 CFR 400.5 in States containing counties which qualify for FY 2005 targeted assistance awards; and 2. non-State agencies funded under the Wilson-Fish program which administer, in lieu of a State, a statewide refugee assistance program containing counties which qualify for FY 2005 targeted assistance formula funds. All such grantees will hereinafter be referred to as "the State".

The Director of ORR determines the eligibility of counties for inclusion in the FY 2005 targeted assistance program on the basis of the method described in section VI of this notice.

The use of targeted assistance funds for services to Cuban and Haitian entrants is limited to States which have an approved State plan under the Cuban/Haitian Entrant Program (CHEP).

The State agency will submit a single application to ORR on behalf of all county governments of the qualified counties in that State. Subsequent to the

approval of the State's agency application by ORR, local targeted assistance plans will be developed by the county government or other designated entity and submitted to the State agency.

A State with more than one qualified county is permitted, but not required, to determine the allocation amount for each qualified county within the State. However, if a State chooses to determine county allocations differently from those set forth in the final notice, in accordance with 45 CFR 400.319, the FY 2005 allocations proposed by the State must be based on the State's population of refugees who arrived in the U.S. during the most recent 5-year period. A State may use welfare data as an additional factor in the allocation of its targeted assistance funds if it so chooses; however, a State may not assign a greater weight to welfare data than it has assigned to population data in its allocation formula. In addition, if a State chooses to allocate its FY 2005 targeted assistance funds in a manner different from the formula set forth in the final notice, the FY 2005 allocations and methodology proposed by the State must be included in the State's application for ORR review and approval.

Applications submitted in response to this final notice are not subject to review by State and area wide clearinghouses under Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs."

VI. Qualification and Allocation

For FY 2005, ORR used the formula which bases allocation of targeted assistance funds on the most current 5-year arrivals data on refugees (*See* Footnote 1, eligible population). Targeted assistance services are limited to the arrival population residing in qualified counties who have been in the U.S. five years or less. As stated in the FY 1999 notice of proposed availability of targeted assistance allocations to States which was published on March 10, 1999 (64 FR 11927), the Director of ORR proposes to determine the qualification of counties for targeted assistance once every three years. The FY 2002—FY 2004 three-year project cycle has expired. This final notice consists of the 48 qualified counties for the FY 2005—FY 2007 three-year project cycle for TAP funds. Counties qualified for TAP FY 2005 funds on the basis of the most current 5-year (10/1/99—9/30/04) population are listed in Tables 1, 2, 4, and 6 in this final notice.

A. Qualifying Counties

For FY 2005 targeted assistance funds, a county (or group of adjacent counties with the same Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, or SMSA) or independent city, was required to: rank above a selected cut-off point of jurisdictions for which data were reviewed, based on two criteria: (a) The number of refugee arrivals placed in the county during the most recent 5-year period (FY 2000—FY 2004); and (b) the 5-year refugee arrival population as a percent of the county overall population.

With regards to the first qualification criteria, each county was ranked on the basis of its 5-year refugee arrival population and its concentration of refugees, with a relative weighting of 2 to 1 respectively, because it is believed that large numbers of arrivals (*see* Footnote 1, eligible population) into a county create a significant impact, regardless of the ratio of refugees to the county general population.

ORR decided to limit the number of qualified counties based on ranking order to the top 48 counties (Table 1) in order to target a sufficient level of funding to the most impacted counties. Each county was ranked in terms of the sum of a county's rank on refugee arrivals and its rank on concentration. A county had to rank within the top 48 counties to qualify for targeted assistance funds.

ORR screened data on all counties that have received awards for targeted assistance since FY 1983, and on all other counties that could potentially qualify for TAP funds based on the criteria published in the proposed notice. Analysis of these data indicates that: (a) Forty-eight (48) counties qualify for targeted assistance funds, Table 1; (b) eleven (11) counties which have previously received targeted assistance would no longer qualify, Table 3; and (c) six (6) new counties qualify for FY 2005 targeted assistance funds, Table 2.

The 48 counties listed in this final notice as qualified to apply for FY 2005 TAP funding would remain qualified for TAP funding through FY 2007. ORR does not plan to consider the eligibility of additional counties for TAP funding until FY 2008, when ORR will again review data on all counties that could potentially qualify for TAP funds based on the criteria contained in the proposed notice published in the June 17, 2005, *Federal Register* [70 FR, vol. 116 (June 17, 2005)]. It is believed that a more frequent re-determination of county qualification for targeted assistance would not provide qualifying counties a sufficient period of time

within a stable funding climate to adequately address the refugee impact in their counties, while a less frequent re-determination of county qualification would pose the risk of not considering new population impacts in a timely manner.

B. Allocation Formula

The FY 2005 targeted assistance amount, \$44,173,066, is allocated by formula to States for the 48 qualified counties based on the initial placements in these counties during the 5-year period from FYs 2000 through 2004 (October 1, 1999—September 30, 2004). Data from the ORR Refugee Arrivals Data System (RADS) was used for the final allocation of funds for targeted assistance. This includes the total number of refugees, Cuban/Haitian entrants, parolees, and Amerasians from Viet Nam. Data on victims of severe forms of trafficking was from the certification and eligibility letters issued by ORR. Trafficking victims have been eligible for services since October 2000 and their family members since December 2003. Data on the number of asylees who have been served in FYs 2000 through 2004 through the refugee resettlement program or social service system were provided by States, including those in response to the proposed notice. For FYs 2000 through 2004, Havana parolees were derived from actual data.

For FY 2005 allocation, many States responded to ORR's voluntary process for data submission on their number of asylees, entrants, or trafficking victims prior and after issuance of the proposed allocations notice. This voluntary process helped minimize adjustments of final allocations. States used the standardized EXCEL format suggested by ORR to submit data on asylees, entrants, and/or victims of a severe form of trafficking served during the 5-year period from FYs 2000 through 2004 (October 1, 1999—September 30, 2004). Data for each population group was submitted separately on an EXCEL spreadsheet. Data submitted was verified by ORR against the ORR arrivals database (RADS), and as a result of this process, adjustments were included in this final notice for FY 2005 allocations for targeted assistance funds.

Documentation submitted by States include the name of state, name of county, name of refugee (*see* Footnote 1, eligible population), alien number, date of birth and date of arrival in the U.S. for each of the eligible populations claimed for targeted assistance funding. Listings of refugees who were not identified by their alien numbers (A-Numbers) were not considered.

Additionally, in FY 2005, ORR asked States to submit list of asylees that they have served in their Targeted Assistance employment services programs. About 49,000 names were submitted. ORR matched these names and A-Numbers with the data that ORR had received from the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) and the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR). However, only about 47 percent or 23,337 of the names submitted were found to match with the records in the database. The primary reasons for the unmatched submissions were that the asylum claim was granted outside the five-year eligibility period, the A-Number did not appear in the ORR database, or the name submitted did not match the A-Number and name in the ORR database. The reason for the lack of the A-number occurred when the head of household applied for asylum but failed to list his/her family members in the asylum claim. The family members eventually received derivative asylum status based upon the head of household claim. These family members may have received ORR-funded services, however, their names do not appear in the database of asylum claimants because they were not included in the initial asylum application of the head of household. Therefore, these individuals remain unverifiable.

VII. Allocations

Table 1 lists the 48 qualifying counties, the State, the number of refugee arrivals (see Footnote 1, eligible population) in those counties during the 5-year period from October 1, 1999–September 30, 2004, the concentration percent to the county overall population, the sum of ranks population, and each county's rank, based on the qualification formula described above.

Table 2 lists the 6 new eligible counties that qualify under the targeted assistance criteria.

Table 3 lists the 11 counties which no longer qualify for TAP funds based upon the qualification formula.

Table 4 lists the final targeted assistance allocations by county for FY 2005.

Table 5 lists the final allocations by State for FY 2005.

Table 6 lists the targeted assistance areas.

VIII. Application and Implementation Process

Under the FY 2005 targeted assistance program, States may apply for and receive grant awards on behalf of qualified counties in the State. A single

allocation will be made to each State by ORR on the basis of an approved State application. The State agency will, in turn, receive, review, and determine the acceptability of individual county targeted assistance plans.

Pursuant to 45 CFR 400.210(b), FY 2005 targeted assistance funds must be obligated by the State agency no later than one year after the end of the Federal fiscal year in which the Department awarded the grant. Funds must be liquidated within two years after the end of the Federal fiscal year in which the Department awarded the grant. A State's final financial report on targeted assistance expenditures must be received no later than ninety days after the end of the two-year expenditure period. If final reports are not received on time, the Department will de-obligate any unexpended funds, including any un-liquidated obligations, on the basis of the State's last filed report.

The requirements regarding the discretionary portion of the targeted assistance program will be addressed under separate continuation grant awards. Continuation applications for these funds are therefore not subject to provisions contained in this notice but to other requirements which will be conveyed separately.

IX. Application Requirements

In applying for targeted assistance funds, a State agency is required to provide the following:

A. Assurance that the targeted assistance funds will be used in accordance with the requirements for grants in 45 CFR part 400.

B. Assurance that the targeted assistance funds will be used in compliance with the administrative requirements for grants in 45 CFR part 92.

C. Assurance that targeted assistance funds will be used primarily for the provision of services which are designed to enable refugees to obtain jobs with less than one year's participation in the targeted assistance program. States must indicate what percentage of FY 2005 targeted assistance formula allocation funds that are used for services will be allocated for employment services.

D. Assurance that targeted assistance funds will not be used to offset funding otherwise available to counties or local jurisdictions from the State agency in its administration of other refugee programs, such as social services, cash and medical assistance.

E. The name of the local agency administering the funds, the name and

telephone number of the responsible person, if administered locally.

F. The amount of funds to be awarded to the targeted county or counties. In instances where a State receives targeted assistance funding for impacted counties contained in a standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) that includes a county or counties located in a neighboring State, the State receiving those funds must provide a description of coordination and planning activities undertaken with the State Refugee Coordinator of the neighboring State in which the impacted county or counties are located. These planning and coordination activities should result in a proposed allocation plan for the equitable distribution of targeted assistance funds by county based on the distribution of the eligible population by county within the SMSA. The proposed allocation plan must be included in the State's application to ORR.

G. Assurance that county targeted assistance plans will include:

1. A description of the local planning process for determining targeted assistance priorities and services, taking into consideration all other ORR-funded services available to the refugee population, including formula social services.

2. Identification of refugee/entrant populations to be served by targeted assistance projects, including approximate numbers of clients to be served, and a description of characteristics and needs of targeted populations. (As per 45 CFR 400.314).

3. Description of specific strategies and services to meet the needs of targeted populations.

4. The relationship of targeted assistance services to other services available to refugees/entrants in the county including formula allocated ORR social services to States/Wilson-Fish agencies.

5. Analysis of available employment opportunities in the local community. Examples of acceptable analysis of employment opportunities might include surveys of employers or potential employers of refugee clients, surveys of presently effective employment service providers, review of studies on employment opportunities/forecasts which would be appropriate to the refugee populations.

6. Description of the monitoring and oversight responsibilities to be carried out by the county or qualifying local jurisdiction.

H. Assurance that the local administrative budget will not exceed 15% of the local allocation. Targeted assistance grants are cost-based awards.

Neither a State nor a county is entitled to a certain amount for administrative costs. Rather, administrative cost requests should be based on projections of actual needs. All TAP counties will be allowed to spend up to 15% of their allocation on TAP administrative costs, as need requires. However, States and counties are strongly encouraged to limit administrative costs to the extent possible to maximize available funding for services to refugees.

I. For any State that administers the program directly or otherwise provides direct services to the refugee/entrant/asylee population in a qualified county (with the concurrence of the county), the State must have the same information contained in a county plan prior to issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for services. States that administer the TAG program directly may spend no more than 5% of the total allocation, and up to 10% of the county's allocation, on administrative costs that are reasonable, allocable, and necessary.

J. A description of the State's plan for conducting fiscal and programmatic monitoring and evaluations of the targeted assistance program, including frequency of on-site monitoring.

K. A line item budget and justification for State administrative costs limited to a maximum of 5% of the total award to the State. Assurance that the State will make available to the county or designated local entity not less than 95% of the amount of its formula allocation for purposes of implementing the activities proposed in its plan. As stated previously, States that administer the program directly in lieu of the county (through a mutual agreement with the qualifying county), may spend no more than 5% of the total award, and up to 10% of the county's TAG allocation on administrative costs. The administrative costs must be reasonable, allocable, and necessary. Allocable costs for State contracting and monitoring for targeted assistance, if charged, must be charged to the targeted assistance grant and not to general State administration.

X. Results or Benefits Expected

All applicants must establish proposed targeted assistance performance goals for each of the six ORR performance outcome measures for each impacted county's proposed service contract(s) or sub-grants for the

next contracting cycle. Proposed performance goals must be included in the application for each performance measure. The six ORR performance measures are: entered employments, cash assistance reductions due to employment, cash assistance terminations due to employment, 90-day employment retentions, average wage at placement, and job placements with available health benefits. Targeted assistance program activity and progress achieved toward meeting performance outcome goals are to be reported quarterly on the ORR-6, the "Quarterly Performance Report."

States that are currently grantees for targeted assistance funds should base projected annual outcome goals on past performance. Current grantees should have adequate baseline data for all of the six ORR performance outcome measures based on a history of targeted assistance program experience.

States identified as new eligible targeted assistance grantees are also required to set proposed outcome goals for each of the six ORR performance outcome measures. New grantees may use baseline data, as available, and current data as reported on the ORR-6 for social services program activity to assist them in the goal-setting process.

New qualifying counties within States that are current grantees are also required to set proposed outcome goals for each of the six ORR performance outcome measures. New counties may use baseline data, as available, and current data as reported on the ORR-6 for social services program activity to assist them in the goal-setting process.

Proposed targeted assistance outcome goals should reflect improvement over past performance and strive for continuous improvement during the project period from one year to another.

Final targeted assistance outcome goals are due on November 15, 2005, in conjunction with the ORR Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) cycle.

XI. Budget and Budget Justification

Provide line item detail and detailed calculations for each budget object class identified on the Budget Information form (424A). Detailed calculations must include estimation methods, quantities, unit costs, and other similar quantitative detail sufficient for the calculation to be

duplicated. The detailed budget must also include a breakout by the funding sources identified in Block 15 of the SF-424.

Provide a narrative budget justification that describes how the categorical costs are derived. Discuss the necessity, reasonableness, and allocability of the proposed costs. The Office of Refugee Resettlement is particularly interested in the following:

A line item budget and justification for State administrative costs limited to a maximum of 5% of the total award to the State. Each total budget period funding amount requested must be necessary, reasonable, and allocable to the project. States that administer the program locally in lieu of the county, through a mutual agreement with the qualifying county, may request administrative costs that add up to, but may not exceed, 10% of the county's TAP allocation to the State's administrative budget.

XII. Reporting Requirements

States are required to submit quarterly reports on the outcomes of the targeted assistance program, using Schedule A and Schedule C of the ORR-6 Quarterly Performance Report (0970-0036).

XIII. The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13)

All information collections within this program notice are approved under the following valid OMB control numbers: 424 (0348-0043); 424A (0348-0044); 424B (0348-0040); Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (0348-0046); Financial Status Report (SF-269) (0348-0039) and ORR Quarterly Performance Report (0970-0036).

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.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and reviewing the collection of information.

Dated: August 18, 2005.

Nguyen Van Hanh,

Director, Office of Refugee Resettlement.

BILLING CODE 4184-01-P

Table 1—Top 48 Eligible Counties

County	State	5-Year Arrival Total	Concentration Percent	Sum of Ranks
1 Dade County	FL	72,960	3.238%	3
2 Ramsey/Hennepin	MN	12,160	0.747%	22
3 Sacramento County	CA	9,342	0.764%	25
4 City of St. Louis	MO	5,061	1.454%	33
5 Dekalb County	GA	6,070	0.912%	34
6 Multnomah County	OR	8,414	0.470%	45
7 King/Snohomish County	WA	9,445	0.367%	52
8 Jefferson County	KY	4,112	0.593%	60
9 Hillsborough County	FL	4,737	0.474%	61
10 Broward County	FL	6,399	0.394%	63
11 Palm Beach County	FL	4,599	0.407%	70
12 Maricopa County	AZ	7,530	0.245%	72
13 Suffolk County	MA	3,248	0.471%	74
14 Onondaga County	NY	2,844	0.621%	75
15 Ingham County	MI	2,330	0.834%	76
16 Oneida County	NY	2,186	0.928%	79
17 Duval County	FL	3,143	0.404%	85
18 Polk County	IA	2,324	0.620%	90
19 Fairfax County	VA	3,537	0.268%	93
20 Harris County	TX	6,931	0.204%	93
21 Orange County	FL	3,115	0.348%	94
22 New York	NY	13,704	0.171%	96
23 Kent County	MI	2,504	0.436%	97
24 Davis/Salt Lake	UT	3,566	0.237%	101
25 Erie County	NY	2,728	0.287%	105
26 Montgomery/Prince George's	MD	3,574	0.213%	105
27 Denver	CO	2,202	0.397%	109
28 San Diego County	CA	5,337	0.190%	111
29 Los Angeles County	CA	12,232	0.128%	112
30 Dallas/Tarrant Counties	TX	6,387	0.174%	113
31 Franklin County	OH	2,595	0.243%	118
32 Davidson County	TN	2,089	0.367%	119
33 Richmond	VA	1,525	0.771%	120
34 Baltimore County	MD	2,145	0.329%	120
35 Guilford County	NC	1,902	0.452%	121
36 Collier County	FL	1,630	0.648%	122
37 Ada County	ID	1,703	0.566%	123
38 Spokane County	WA	1,842	0.441%	124
39 Santa Clara County	CA	3,195	0.190%	128
40 Minnehaha County	SD	1,262	0.851%	129
41 Cass County	ND	1,223	0.993%	130
42 Cook/Kane Counties	IL	6,902	0.119%	131
43 Hamden County	MA	1,803	0.395%	132
44 Philadelphia	PA	2,983	0.197%	132
45 Fulton County	GA	2,084	0.255%	133
46 Mecklenburg County	NC	1,924	0.277%	134
47 Monroe County	NY	1,963	0.267%	134
48 Clark County	NV	2,708	0.197%	137

Table 2 -- Six New Counties That Qualify

County	State	5-Year Arrival Total	Concentration Percent	Sum of Ranks
1 Orange County	FL	3,115	0.348%	94
2 Montgomery/Prince George's	MD	3,574	0.210%	105
3 Franklin County	OH	2,595	0.240%	118
4 Baltimore	MD	2,145	0.330%	120
5 Collier County	FL	1,630	0.650%	122
6 Mecklenberg County	NC	1,924	0.280%	134

Table 3-- Eleven Counties That No Longer Qualify

County	State	5-Year Arrival Total	Concentration Percent	Sum of Ranks
1 Pinellas County	FL	2,064	0.220%	144
2 Warren County	KY	989	1.070%	149
3 Erie County	PA	1,285	0.460%	149
4 Lancaster County	NE	1,193	0.480%	158
5 District of Columbia	DC	1,360	0.240%	172
6 Kansas City	MO	1,624	0.200%	183
7 Orange County	CA	2,361	0.080%	190
8 Cuyahoga County	OH	1,761	0.130%	205
9 San Francisco	CA	1,674	0.100%	217
10 Wayne County	MI	1,335	0.060%	257
11 Blackhawk County	IA	515	0.400%	258

Table 4—Final Targeted Assistance Allocations By County: FY 2005

							\$44,173,066
County	State	Refugees 1/	Entrants	Havana Parolees 2/	Asylees Traffickees	Total Arrivals FY00–FY04	Total FY 2005 Allocation
1 Maricopa County	Arizona	6,623	765	9	133	7,530	\$1,213,074
2 Los Angeles County	California	9,701	35	92	2404	12,232	1,970,558
3 Sacramento County	California	9,260	0	3	79	9,342	1,504,982
4 San Diego County 3/	California	4,142	3	14	1178	5,337	859,783
5 Santa Clara County	California	2,696	2	2	495	3,195	514,710
6 Denver County 3/	Colorado	2,048	0	0	154	2,202	354,739
7 Broward County	Florida	307	1,672	1,449	2971	6,399	1,030,870
8 Collier County	Florida	104	362	990	174	1,630	262,591
9 Miami-Dade County	Florida	5,216	21,164	41,470	5110	72,960	11,753,751
10 Duval County	Florida	2,703	66	161	213	3,143	506,333
11 Hillsborough County	Florida	1,201	990	2,071	475	4,737	763,124
12 Orange County	Florida	750	445	677	1243	3,115	501,822
13 Palm Beach County	Florida	322	1,716	1,551	1010	4,599	740,892
14 DeKalb County	Georgia	5,890	9	23	148	6,070	977,868
15 Fulton County	Georgia	1,989	10	23	62	2,084	335,729
16 Ada County 3/	Idaho	1,690	0	1	12	1,703	274,351
17 Cook/Kane	Illinois	6,415	23	100	364	6,902	1,111,902
18 Polk County	Iowa	2,324	0	0	0	2,324	374,393
19 Jefferson County 3/	Kentucky	2,092	1,958	31	31	4,112	662,437
20 Baltimore County	Maryland	1,768	0	3	374	2,145	345,556
21 Montgomery/Prince George's	Maryland	1,950	5	21	1598	3,574	575,766
22 Hampden County 3/	Massachusetts	1,777	0	0	26	1,803	290,461
23 Suffolk County 3/	Massachusetts	2,544	91	7	606	3,248	523,248
24 Ingham County	Michigan	1,359	955	16		2,330	375,360
25 Kent County	Michigan	2,211	260	31	2	2,504	403,391
26 Hennepin/Ramsey	Minnesota	11,964	5	5	186	12,160	1,958,959
27 City of St. Louis	Missouri	5,005	0	2	54	5,061	815,320
28 Clark County 3/	Nevada	1,458	1,161	89		2,708	436,255
29 Erie County	New York	2,266	440	3	19	2,728	439,477
30 Monroe County	New York	1,588	356	12	7	1,963	316,236
31 New York	New York	11,190	237	147	2130	13,704	2,207,695
32 Oneida County	New York	2,181	0	0	5	2,186	352,161
33 Onondaga County	New York	2,023	817	4		2,844	458,164
34 Guilford County	North Carolina	1,799	2	23	78	1,902	306,409
35 Mecklenberg County	North Carolina	1,722	13	22	167	1,924	309,954
36 Cass 3/	North Dakota	1,222	0	0	1	1,223	197,024
37 Franklin County	Ohio	2,282	3	4	306	2,595	418,051
38 Multnomah	Oregon	7,603	715	5	91	8,414	1,355,483
39 Philadelphia County	Pennsylvania	2,854	14	23	92	2,983	480,557
40 Minnehaha County 3/	South Dakota	1,251	0	4	7	1,262	203,306
41 Davidson County	Tennessee	2,043	6	40		2,089	336,535
42 Dallas/Tarrant	Texas	5,941	8	76	362	6,387	1,028,937
43 Harris County	Texas	5,175	1,404	34	318	6,931	1,116,574
44 Davis/Salt Lake	Utah	3,454	5	1	106	3,566	574,477
45 Fairfax County	Virginia	2,981	1	17	538	3,537	569,806
46 City of Richmond	Virginia	1,497	13	7	8	1,525	245,675
47 King/Snohomish	Washington	9,434	0	11		9,445	1,521,576
48 Spokane County	Washington	1,842	0	0		1,842	296,744
Total		165,857	35,731	49,274	23,337	274,199	\$ 44,173,066

**Table 5 - Final Targeted Assistance Allocations By State
FY 2005**

State	\$44,173,066 Total FY 2005 Allocation
Arizona	\$1,213,074
California	4,850,033
Colorado	354,739
Florida	15,559,383
Georgia	1,313,597
Idaho	274,351
Illinois	1,111,902
Iowa	374,393
Kentucky	662,437
Maryland	921,322
Massachusetts	813,709
Michigan	778,751
Minnesota	1,958,959
Missouri	815,320
Nevada	436,255
New York	3,773,733
North Carolina	616,363
North Dakota	197,024
Ohio	418,051
Oregon	1,355,483
Pennsylvania	480,557
South Dakota	203,306
Tennessee	336,535
Texas	2,145,511
Utah	574,477
Virginia	815,481
Washington	1,818,320
Total	\$44,173,066

Table 6 - Targeted Assistance Areas

State	Targeted Assistance Area	Definition
Arizona	Maricopa County	
California	Los Angeles County	
	Sacramento County	
	San Diego	
	Santa Clara County	
Colorado	Denver	
Florida	Broward County	
	Collier County	
	Dade County	
	Duval County	
	Hillsborough County	
	Orange County	
	Palm Beach County	
Georgia	DeKalb County	
	Fulton County	
Idaho	Ada County	
Illinois	Cook and Kane Counties	
Iowa	Polk County	
Kentucky	Jefferson County	
Maryland	Baltimore County	
	Montgomery/Prince George's County	
Massachusetts	Hampden County	
	Suffolk County	
Michigan	Ingham County	
	Kent County	
Minnesota	Hennepin/Ramsey	
Missouri	City of St. Louis	
Nevada	Clark County	
New York	Erie County	
	Monroe County	
	New York	Bronx, Kings, Queens, New York, and Richmond Counties
	Oneida County	
	Onondaga County	
North Carolina	Cuiford County	
	Mecklenberg County	
North Dakota	Cass County	
Ohio	Franklin County	
Oregon	Multnomah	Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties, Oregon, and Clark County, Washington
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia County	
South Dakota	Minnehaha County	
Texas	Dallas/Tarrant	
	Harris County	
Tennessee	Davidson County	
Utah	Davis/Salt Lake.....	Davis, Salt Lake, and Utah Counties
Virginia	Fairfax.....	Arlington and Fairfax Counties and the cities of Falls Church, Fairfax, and Alexandria
	City of Richmond	
Washington	King/Snohomish	
	Spokane County	

[FR Doc. 05-17373 Filed 9-1-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184-01-C

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration****Current List of Laboratories Which Meet Minimum Standards To Engage in Urine Drug Testing for Federal Agencies****AGENCY:** Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, HHS.**ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) notifies Federal agencies of the laboratories currently certified to meet the standards of Subpart C of the Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs (Mandatory Guidelines). The Mandatory Guidelines were first published in the **Federal Register** on April 11, 1988 (53 FR 11970), and subsequently revised in the **Federal Register** on June 9, 1994 (59 FR 29908), on September 30, 1997 (62 FR 51118), and on April 13, 2004 (69 FR 19644).

A notice listing all currently certified laboratories is published in the **Federal Register** during the first week of each month. If any laboratory's certification is suspended or revoked, the laboratory will be omitted from subsequent lists until such time as it is restored to full certification under the Mandatory Guidelines.

If any laboratory has withdrawn from the HHS National Laboratory Certification Program (NLCP) during the past month, it will be listed at the end, and will be omitted from the monthly listing thereafter.

This notice is also available on the Internet at <http://workplace.samhsa.gov> and <http://www.drugfreeworkplace.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mrs. Giselle Hersh or Dr. Walter Vogl, Division of Workplace Programs, SAMHSA/CSAP, Room 2-1035, 1 Choke Cherry Road, Rockville, Maryland 20857; 240-276-2600 (voice), 240-276-2610 (fax).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Mandatory Guidelines were developed in accordance with Executive Order 12564 and section 503 of Public Law 100-71. Subpart C of the Mandatory Guidelines, "Certification of Laboratories Engaged in Urine Drug Testing for Federal Agencies," sets strict standards that laboratories must meet in order to conduct drug and specimen validity tests on urine specimens for

Federal agencies. To become certified, an applicant laboratory must undergo three rounds of performance testing plus an on-site inspection. To maintain that certification, a laboratory must participate in a quarterly performance testing program plus undergo periodic, on-site inspections.

Laboratories which claim to be in the applicant stage of certification are not to be considered as meeting the minimum requirements described in the HHS Mandatory Guidelines. A laboratory must have its letter of certification from HHS/SAMHSA (formerly: HHS/NIDA) which attests that it has met minimum standards.

In accordance with Subpart C of the Mandatory Guidelines dated April 13, 2004 (69 FR 19644), the following laboratories meet the minimum standards to conduct drug and specimen validity tests on urine specimens:

ACL Laboratories, 8901 W. Lincoln Ave., West Allis, WI 53227, 414-328-7840/800-877-7016, (Formerly: Bayshore Clinical Laboratory).

ACM Medical Laboratory, Inc., 160 Elmgrove Park, Rochester, NY 14624, 585-429-2264.

Advanced Toxicology Network, 3560 Air Center Cove, Suite 101, Memphis, TN 38118, 901-794-5770/888-290-1150.

Aegis Analytical Laboratories, Inc., 345 Hill Ave., Nashville, TN 37210, 615-255-2400.

Baptist Medical Center-Toxicology Laboratory, 9601 I-630, Exit 7, Little Rock, AR 72205-7299, 501-202-2783, (Formerly: Forensic Toxicology Laboratory Baptist Medical Center). Clinical Reference Lab, 8433 Quivira Road, Lenexa, KS 66215-2802, 800-445-6917.

Diagnostic Services, Inc., dba DSI, 12700 Westlinks Drive, Fort Myers, FL 33913, 239-561-8200/800-735-5416.

Doctors Laboratory, Inc., 2906 Julia Drive, Valdosta, GA 31602, 229-671-2281.

DrugScan, Inc., P.O. Box 2969, 1119 Mearns Road, Warminster, PA 18974, 215-674-9310.

Dynacare Kasper Medical Laboratories*, 10150-102 St., Suite 200, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5J 5E2, 780-451-3702/800-661-9876.

ElSohly Laboratories, Inc., 5 Industrial Park Drive, Oxford, MS 38655, 662-236-2609.

Express Analytical Labs, 3405 7th Ave., Suite 106, Marion, IA 52302, 319-377-0500.

Gamma-Dynacare Medical Laboratories*, A Division of the Gamma-Dynacare, Laboratory

Partnership, 245 Pall Mall Street, London, ONT, Canada N6A 1P4, 519-679-1630.

General Medical Laboratories, 36 South Brooks St., Madison, WI 53715, 608-267-6225.

Kroll Laboratory Specialists, Inc., 1111 Newton St., Gretna, LA 70053, 504-361-8989/800-433-3823, (Formerly: Laboratory Specialists, Inc.).

LabOne, Inc., 10101 Renner Blvd., Lenexa, KS 66219, 913-888-3927/800-873-8845, (Formerly: Center for Laboratory Services, a Division of LabOne, Inc.).

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 7207 N. Gessner Road, Houston, TX 77040, 713-856-8288/800-800-2387.

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 69 First Ave., Raritan, NJ 08869, 908-526-2400/800-437-4986, (Formerly: Roche Biomedical Laboratories, Inc.).

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 1904 Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, 919-572-6900/800-833-3984, (Formerly: LabCorp Occupational Testing Services, Inc., CompuChem Laboratories, Inc.; CompuChem Laboratories, Inc., A Subsidiary of Roche Biomedical Laboratory; Roche CompuChem Laboratories, Inc., A Member of the Roche Group).

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 10788 Roselle St., San Diego, CA 92121, 800-882-7272, (Formerly: Poisonlab, Inc.).

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 550 17th Ave., Suite 300, Seattle, WA 98122, 206-923-7020/800-898-0180, (Formerly: DrugProof, Division of Dynacare/Laboratory of Pathology, LLC; Laboratory of Pathology of Seattle, Inc.; DrugProof, Division of Laboratory of Pathology of Seattle, Inc.).

Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings, 1120 Main Street, Southaven, MS 38671, 866-827-8042/800-233-6339, (Formerly: LabCorp Occupational Testing Services, Inc.; MedExpress/National Laboratory Center).

Marshfield Laboratories, Forensic Toxicology Laboratory, 1000 North Oak Ave., Marshfield, WI 54449, 715-389-3734/800-331-3734.

MAXXAM Analytics Inc. *, 6740 Campobello Road, Mississauga, ON, Canada L5N 2L8, 905-817-5700, (Formerly: NOVAMANN (Ontario), Inc.).

MedTox Laboratories, Inc., 402 W. County Road D, St. Paul, MN 55112, 651-636-7466/800-832-3244.