meet the requirements of the Federal Paperwork Reduction Act; and (5) develops the business process and functionality for pertinent Electronic Research Administration components.

Division of Extramural Inventions and Technology Resources (HNA343). (1) Ensures proper and complete compliance with mandated patent policies and procedures; (2) informs grantees, contractors, and NIH staff of their responsibilities through various policy and administration manual issuances, and instructions and commentary in the *NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts*; (3) receives and maintains all documentation relating to extramural inventions made with the assistance of research grants or research and development contracts from NIH; (4) promotes the proper utilization of patents and inventions in extramural programs through guidance or referral on licensing agreements and distribution of shares resources; and (5) develops the business process and functionality for progress reporting, abstracting, research resources and other pertinent Electronic Research Administration components.

Division of Extramural Information Systems (HNA345). (1) Provides computer systems design, programming, and systems maintenance for the IMPAC/CRISP systems and the ancillary systems supporting the NIH extramural grants management program; (2) maintains a comprehensive systems overview, providing data systems currency and ensuring interoperability between IMPAC and related subsystems; (3) facilitates the interoperability with Electronic Research Administration functional components and interfaces; (4) develops specifications for the interoperability of IMPAC, CRISP, Committee Management Information, Trainee Appointment, payback, and other related auxiliary data systems; (5) maintains overall integrity of data systems while making changes and enhancements to satisfy NIH needs; (6) develops quality control procedures in data capture functions; (7) reconciles data integrity issues; and (8) performs assigned data capture functions.

Office of Reports and Analysis (HNA36). This office is responsible for: (1) maintaining CRISP, the Computer Retrieval of Information on Scientific Projects System database, by adding scientific information and indexing terms to IMPAC records for funded PHS research; (2) maintaining and updating the CRISP Thesaurus as emerging concepts and technologies are developed; (3) editing all IMPAC titles for accuracy and uniformity; (4) publishing reports based on the CRISP database; (5) conducting statistical investigations of extramural trends and related topics; (6) designing, establishing, and maintaining databases to compile and analyze information relevant to policy or program issues; (7) developing and conducting special projects, experiments, and simulations to support planning and evaluation of programs, policies and procedures; (8) serving as a focal point for requests from individual Institutes and Centers for *ad hoc* statistical reports; (9) supporting NIH budget development by providing financial projections and reports; and (10) providing consultation to CRISP and IMPAC users.

(2) Under the heading *Division of Research Grants (HNG),* insert the following:

Division of Research Grants (HNG). (1) Provides staff support to the Office of the Director, NIH, in the formulation of grant and award policies and procedures; (2) provides central receipt of all PHS applications for research and research training support, and makes initial referral to PHS components; (3) assigns NIH applications to supporting institutes, centers, and divisions and to DRG initial review groups; and (4) provides for scientific review of NIH research grants, National Research Service Awards, and research career development applications.

Advanced Technology Branch (HNG3). (1) Establishes comprehensive long-range plans for developing, implementing, supporting, and expanding all systems on the DRG LAN and the NIH mainframe relating to DRG extramural activities; (2) conducts studies and analyses for new LAN- and PC-based automatic data processing applications; (3) provides end-user support across NIH/PHS for DRG-developed systems; (4) maintains hardware, software and related on-site services for the PC workstations and LAN for DRG and OD/OER components in the Rockledge Building; (5) serves as the focal point for responding to NIH IRM studies and dissemination of IRM information; (6) manages DRG risk assessments and life cycle planning; and (7) plans for the acquisition of all DRG ADP requirements.

Dated: July 1, 1996.

Ruth L. Kirschstein,

Acting Director, NIH.

[FR Doc. 96–17820 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

Office of Refugee Resettlement

Refugee Resettlement Program; Availability of Formula Allocation Funding for FY 1996 Targeted Assistance Grants for Services to Refugees in Local Areas of High Need

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

ACTION: Final notice of availability of formula allocation funding for FY 1996 targeted assistance grants to States for services to refugees [1] in local areas of high need.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of funds and award procedures for FY 1996 targeted assistance grants 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 high use of public assistance, and where specific needs exist for supplementation of currently available resources. This notice reflects the final rule published in the Federal Register on June 28, 1995 (60 FR 33584) which was effective October 1, 1995. This rule established a new subpart L, providing regulations for the Targeted Assistance Program (TAP) for the first time.

This notice announces that the qualification of counties is based on refugee and entrant arrivals during the 5-year period from FY 1991 through FY 1995, in keeping with ORR's new regulation, and on the concentration of refugees and entrants as a percentage of the general population. Under this notice, 15 new counties will qualify for targeted assistance and 18 counties which previously received targeted assistance grants will no longer qualify for targeted assistance funding. This notice also establishes a new allocation formula to reflect the limitation on the

[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 Cuban and Haitian entrants, certain Amerasians from Vietnam who are admitted to the U.S. as immigrants, and certain Amerasians from Vietnam who are U.S. citizens. (See section II of this notice on ''Authorization.'') 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.

Refugees admitted to the U.S. under admissions numbers set aside for private-sector-initiative admissions are not eligible to be served under the targeted assistance program (or under other programs supported by Federal refugee funds) during their period of coverage under their sponsoring agency's agreement with the Department of State—usually two years from their date of arrival, or until they obtain permanent resident alien status, whichever comes first.

use of targeted assistance funding for services to refugees who have resided in the United States 5 years or less.

In addition, this notice replaces the schedule of allowable administrative cost amounts for local administrative budgets that appeared in previous notices with an allowable administrative cost amount of up to 15% for all TAP counties for the purpose of increasing local flexibility and oversight.

The final notice reflects an adjustment in final allocations to States as a result of additional arrival data.

A notice of proposed allocation of targeted assistance funds was published for public comment in the Federal Register on May 6, 1996 (61 FR 20260).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Toyo Biddle (202) 401–9250.

APPLICATION DEADLINE: The closing date for submission of applications is August 12, 1996. Applications postmarked after the closing date will be classified as late.

Mailed applications shall be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are either received on or before the deadline date or sent on or before the deadline date to: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Refugee Resettlement, Division of Refugee Self-Sufficiency, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., Washington, DC 20447, Attention: Application for Targeted Assistance Formula Program.

Applicants are cautioned to request a legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark or to obtain a legibly dated receipt from a commercial carrier or the U.S. Postal Service. Private metered postmarks shall not be acceptable as proof of timely mailing.

Applications handcarried by applicants, applicant couriers, or by overnight/express mail couriers shall be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are received on or before the deadline date, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Refugee Resettlement, Division of Refugee Self-Sufficiency, ACF Mailroom, 2nd Floor Loading Dock, Aerospace Center, 901 D Street SW., Washington, DC 20024, between Monday and Friday (excluding Federal holidays). (Applicants are cautioned that express/overnight mail services do not always deliver as agreed.)

ACF cannot accommodate transmission of applications by fax or through other electronic media. Therefore, applications transmitted to ACF electronically will not be accepted regardless of date or time of submission and time of receipt.

To be considered complete, an application package must include a signed original and two copies of Standard Form 424, 424A, and 424B, dated April 1988. (We will provide copies of these materials to all targeted assistance States.)

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE (CFDA) NUMBER: 93.584.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON APPLICATION PROCEDURES: States should contact their State Analyst in ORR.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Purpose and Scope

This notice announces the availability of funds for grants for targeted assistance for services to refugees in counties where, because of factors such as unusually large refugee populations, high refugee concentrations, and high use of public assistance, 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 $55,397,000 in FY 1996 funds for the targeted assistance program (TAP) as part of the FY 1996 appropriation for the Department of Health and Human Services (Pub. L. 104–134).

The FY 1996 House Appropriations Committee Report (H.R. Rept. No. 104–209) reads as follows with respect to targeted assistance funds:

This program provides grants to States for counties which are impacted by high concentrations of refugees and high dependency rates. The Committee agrees that $19,000,000 is available for targeted assistance to serve communities affected by the Cuban and Haitian entrants and refugees whose arrivals in recent years have increased. The Committee has set-aside 20 percent of these funds for increased support to communities with large concentrations of refugees whose cultural differences make assimilation especially difficult justifying a more intense and longer duration level of Federal assistance.

The Conference Report on Appropriations (H. Rept. No. 104–537) agrees with the allocation of targeted assistance contained in the House Report.

The Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) will use the $55,397,000 appropriated for FY 1996 targeted assistance as follows:

- $25,317,600 will be allocated under the 5-year population formula, as set forth in this notice.
- $19,000,000 will be awarded to serve communities most heavily affected by recent Cuban and Haitian entrant arrivals.
- $11,079,400 (20% of the total) will be awarded under a discretionary grant announcement that has been issued separately setting forth application requirements and evaluation criteria. These funds will be used to provide increased support to communities with large concentrations of refugees whose cultural differences make assimilation especially difficult, in accordance with the intent of Congress as reflected in the House Appropriations Committee Report.

In addition, the Office of Refugee Resettlement will have available an additional $5,000,000 in FY 1996 funds for the targeted assistance discretionary program through the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996 (Pub. L. 104–107). These funds are to be used for grants to localities most heavily impacted by the influx of refugees such as Laotian Hmong, Cambodians and Soviet Pentecostals, and will be awarded under a discretionary grant announcement which has been issued setting forth application requirements and evaluation criteria.

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); 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 Vietnam the authorities pertaining to assistance for refugees established by section 412(c)(2) of the INA, as cited above, including certain Amerasians from Vietnam 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).

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 is developed for each eligible family that addresses the family's needs from time of arrival until attainment of economic independence. (See §§ 400.79 and 400.156(g) of the final rule.) Each family self-sufficiency plan should address a family's needs for both employment-related services and other needed social services. The family self-sufficiency 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; and (3) employability plans for every employable member of the family. In local jurisdictions that have both 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. Effective October 1, 1995, under new regulations at § 400.315(b) published in the Federal Register on June 28, 1995, (60 FR 33584), 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). States may, however, continue to provide employability services through September 30, 1996, or until the services are completed, whichever occurs first, to refugees who have been in the U.S. for more than 60 months, who were receiving employability services, as defined in § 400.316, as of September 30, 1995, as part of an employability plan.

In accordance with § 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)), 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 § 400.313 of the final rule, 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 § 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 which are not directed toward the achievement of a specific employment objective in less than one year but which are essential to the adjustment of refugees in the community, provided such needs are clearly demonstrated and such use is approved by the State. Allowable services include those listed under § 400.316.

Reflecting section 412(a)(1)(A)(iv) of the INA, States must insure that women have the same opportunities as men to participate in training and instruction. In addition, in accordance with § 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 staffs to ensure adequate service access by refugee women. The Director 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 assure availability of day care services 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, day care may be treated as a priority employment-related service under the targeted assistance program. Refugees who are participating in TAP-funded or social services-funded employment services or have accepted employment are eligible for day care services for children. For an employed refugee, TAP-funded day care should be limited to one year after the refugee becomes employed. States and counties, however, are expected to use day care funding from other publicly funded mainstream programs as a prior resources and are encouraged to work with service providers to assure maximum access to other publicly funded resources for day care.

In accordance with § 400.317 in the new regulations, 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 which are designed specifically to meet refugee needs and are in keeping with the rules and objectives of the refugee program. Vocational or job-skills training, on-the-job training, or English language training, however, need not be refugee-specific.

When planning targeted assistance services, States must take into account

the reception and placement (R & P) services provided by local resettlement agencies in order to utilize these resources in the overall program design and to ensure the provision of seamless, coordinated services to refugees that are not duplicative. See § 400.156(b).

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 a 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 picture. 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 notice will be contingent upon the completeness of a State's application as described in section IX, below.

IV. Discussion of Comments Received

Twenty-three letters of comment were received in response to the notice of proposed availability of FY 1996 funds for targeted assistance. The comments are summarized below and are followed in each case by the Department's response.

Comment: Six commenters expressed concern about the Cuban entrant figures being used to determine eligibility. Two commenters were concerned about the accuracy of the data being used. Three commenters were concerned about the fact that States were only given 30 days to submit documentation to support the adjustment of county arrival numbers to reflect parolees who originated in Havana. Two of these commenters requested a 60-day delay to review the data. One commenter objected to the fact that ORR was placing the onus on the States to submit supporting documentation and recommended that the revised allocation be circulated for comment before the notice is made final. One commenter noted that the Cuban arrivals for October, November, and December 1995 were significant but are not included in the TAP formula for this year.

Response: The 5-year arrival data used to determine county eligibility and targeted assistance allocations to counties are derived from the ORR Refugee Data System. ORR refugee arrival data are based on monthly refugee/Amerasian arrival data received from the Refugee Data Center (RDC) in New York. These data are then matched with monthly port-of-entry data received from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to identify and correct discrepancies. Cuban/Haitian entrant data received from the Community Relations Service (CRS) in the Department of Justice, the agency responsible for the initial resettlement of Cuban and Haitian entrants in the U.S., are merged with the refugee/Amerasian data file, providing a complete refugee/entrant/Amerasian arrival file. There is no other refugee/entrant arrival data system that is as accurate and comprehensive as the ORR Data System.

However, as we acknowledged in the May 6 notice of proposed allocations, ORR arrival data do not include Cuban parolees who came to the United States directly from Havana in FY 1995. Because these parolees were not resettled through any sponsoring agencies, there is no reliable source of destination data for these parolees at this time. We indicated in the Allocation Formula section of the May 6 notice that States could receive credit for their Havana parolee population with the submission of documented evidence. One State, Florida, where the great majority of Cuban entrants and parolees resettle, submitted documentation of Havana parolee arrivals to its counties. Florida's arrival population has been appropriately credited.

In the case of qualified targeted assistance counties that were not able to submit evidence of Havana parolee arrivals, we have devised a method of crediting each county with a share of Havana parolees that we believe is a reasonable proxy in the absence of hard data. ORR has credited each qualified TAP county that received entrant arrivals during the 5-year period from FY 1991 through FY 1995 with a prorated share of the estimated 10,279 parolees who came directly from Havana during FY 1995. The proration is based on the percentage of the total 5-year entrant arrival population that each qualified county received. Thus, for example, San Diego County, which received 378 entrants during the period from FY 1991–FY 1995, received 0.69 percent of the entrants who resettled in the United States during the 5-year period. San Diego, therefore, would be credited with the same percentage of the estimated 10,279 Havana parolees, or 71 parolees, increasing San Diego's 5-year population from 13,579 to 13,650. These adjustments in county 5-year refugee/entrant arrivals are reflected in the third column of table 3 in this notice.

Regarding the comment about Cuban parolees who arrived after FY 1995, the commenter is correct, Cuban arrivals for October, November, and December 1995 are not included in the TAP formula this year because FY 1996 allocations are based on arrivals during the 5-year period from FY 1991 through FY 1995. Targeted assistance counties will be given credit for Cuban parolees who arrived during FY 1996 in the targeted assistance allocations for FY 1997

Comment: One commenter requested that ORR review the procedure for awarding the $19 million Cuban/Haitian set-aside to only those counties which qualify for targeted assistance to determine if deserving counties are excluded from consideration for set-aside funds.

Response: After considering the commenter's request, we have decided to include any county that received 900 or more entrant arrivals from FY 1991 through FY 1995 for eligibility for Cuban/Haitian set-aside funds, instead of limiting qualification for these funds only to counties eligible for regular targeted assistance formula funds. In reviewing congressional report language regarding the use of the special set-aside funds (H.R. Rept. No. 104–209), we believe congressional intent would be better served if eligibility for Cuban/Haitian set-aside funds is open to all counties affected by recent Cuban and

Haitian arrivals, regardless of their eligibility for regular targeted assistance funds. We re-examined the eligibility of all counties that received entrant arrivals over the past 5 years to identify all counties with 900 or more entrant arrivals, based on documented arrival data. Two additional counties, Broward County and Hillsborough County, FL, were found to have 900 or more entrant arrivals and are, therefore, eligible to receive set-aside funds.

Comment: Five commenters questioned the limiting of eligible counties to the top 38 counties. One commenter wondered what the rationale was for arriving at the cut-off of 38. Four commenters questioned why the Denver metropolitan area, which ranked 39th with an arrival population of more than 5,000 refugees, was not included among the list of eligible counties and recommended including Denver in the final notice. Two of these commenters recommended that we allow all counties with 5,000 or more refugee arrivals to qualify. One commenter who felt that refugee population is a much more significant factor than concentration recommended that ORR assign 3 times as much weight to population as to concentration. One commenter asked how many counties were considered for qualification.

Response: ORR proposed to limit the number of qualified counties to the top 38 counties in order to cover as many counties as possible while still targeting a sufficient level of funding to the most impacted counties. The decision to place the cut-off after the 38th county was based on the fact that a sufficient point difference existed in the sum of ranks between the 38th county and the 39th county, the Denver metropolitan area, to constitute a natural break. In contrast, the summed scores between the 39th county through the next several counties were clustered within a very narrow point range.

In regard to the qualification of the Denver metropolitan area, this metropolitan area, which is made up of 5 counties, does not qualify for targeted assistance. While the Denver area had over 5,000 refugee arrivals, the percentage of refugees to the general population was low. However, Denver County, which has over 62 percent of the refugee arrivals in the 5-county area and a much higher refugee-to-general population ratio than the 5-county area, when considered alone, ranks as the 26th county. We have, therefore, decided to include Denver County, as the 26th county, on the qualified county list. The addition of Denver changes the rank of the subsequent counties on the qualified list, shifting Oakland County, MI from 38 to 39, thereby increasing the list of qualified counties to the top 39 counties.

We do not agree with the suggestion that ORR should allow all counties with 5,000 or more refugees to qualify for targeted assistance. Our statutory language requires ORR to take into account refugee concentrations as well as refugee population numbers as factors in qualifying counties for targeted assistance. A county with 5,000 or more refugees may have a very low concentration rank that results in a summed score that is not high enough to legitimately qualify the county for targeted assistance. We also do not agree with the suggestion that population should be given 3 times as much weight as concentration. This weighting would reduce the factor of concentration to insignificance, contrary to our understanding of congressional intent.

Regarding the number of counties that were considered for qualification, 1,000 counties were considered.

Comment: One commenter requested clarification on the methodology used to qualify counties. The commenter wondered whether assigning a weight of 2 to the 5-year arrival population means that the number of arrivals in each county were multiplied by two and then all counties were ranked based on this number. The commenter also wondered whether refugee concentration was calculated by computing a ratio of the number of refugees to the total population and whether old refugees only or old refugees plus new arrivals were divided by the total population. The commenter wondered whether the final ranking was the sum of the population ranking and the concentration ranking.

Response: In regard to the weight given to the factor of population, a county's rank on arrivals from FY 1991 through FY 1995 was multiplied by 2. Thus, if county X had a rank of 4 for arrivals, this rank was multiplied by 2, giving a total of 8. Refugee concentration was calculated by dividing the number of refugee/entrant arrivals to a county during the 5-year period by the county's general population number, thus yielding the percentage that the 5-year arrivals represent of the county's general population. The counties were ranked on the basis of their refugee concentration, with the county having the highest refugee concentration assigned a rank of 1. A county's population rank (multiplied by 2) was then added to its concentration rank for a summed rank score. Counties were then ranked in order of their summed scores, with the county with the lowest summed score given the rank of 1. If county X, mentioned earlier, ranked 1 on concentration, its summed score would be 9 (8+1). If the score of 9 happens to be the lowest summed score, then county X would be ranked as the top county, with a rank of 1.

Comment: Thirteen commenters expressed concerns about the factors used in the formula to determine county qualification. Ten commenters objected to the exclusion of secondary migrants in the population count. Four commenters recommended that a State's secondary migration numbers could be allocated to each county based on the proportion of new arrivals going to those counties. Two commenters objected to the fact that ORR is not taking welfare dependency into account when determining eligibility. One commenter recommended that we use population as the sole eligibility criterion, since we allocate TAP formula funds according to population. Another commenter recommended that we determine eligibility at the municipality level, instead of at the county level.

Response: As we have noted in previous years, we are not able to include secondary migrants in the population count for targeted assistance because secondary migration data are not available at the county level. States report annually on in-migration at the State level using the ORR–11. This reporting is based on the first three digits of a refugee's Social Security Number (SSN). These digits identify the State in which the SSN was issued which, with a few exceptions, is the State of initial resettlement. This information enables ORR both to credit the State of in-migration and to debit the State of out-migration in developing State population estimates. Most States and counties are not able to provide county secondary migration data, which would involve tracking intrastate movement. Such data would be very difficult to construct since it would be necessary to determine both in-migration and out-migration for all targeted assistance counties in order to arrive at adjusted population estimates.

The suggestion to allocate a State's secondary migration numbers to each county based on the proportion of new arrivals in the State going to those counties, is an idea that warrants some consideration. We can see problems with using a proportion of State secondary migration data as a proxy for actual data on county secondary migration because the use of secondary migration data involves both credits and debits for in- and out-migration. However, we are willing to look further

into the feasibility of using this method or some form of it in FY 1997.

Regarding the use of welfare dependency data, ORR no longer uses welfare dependency as a qualifying factor because data that would accurately reflect refugee dependency rates with any reasonable scope do not exist. While some States collect refugee recipient data in the AFDC program, many States and counties no longer collect such data. Using these data for some counties and not for others would be inequitable. As discussed in Section V, if a State with more than one eligible targeted assistance county collects welfare dependency data, such data may be used by the State to determine county allocations differently from the allocations set forth in this notice.

Regarding the suggestion that we use population as the only qualifying criterion, ORR must take into account all eligibility factors which are outlined in the statute for which data are available. In section 412(c)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the three factors for targeted assistance are high population, high refugee concentration, and high use of public assistance. While we do not have available welfare dependency data, data are available on refugee population and refugee concentration. Therefore, we are required to use both factors in determining county qualification.

Regarding the suggestion that ORR determine eligibility at the municipality level, ORR is required by statute to make grants to States for assistance to counties and similar areas. Therefore, we do not consider smaller municipalities, such as townships, for targeted assistance eligibility.

Comment: Six commenters recommended that ORR determine country eligibility on an annual basis instead of the proposed three-year eligibility period. The commenters felt that the three-year eligibility period does not account for fluctuations in arrivals.

Response: As the notice indicates, we proposed maintaining county eligibility for three years in order to allow counties an adequate period of time to address the refugee impact in their counties. An annual redetermination of county qualification would not provide the funding stability needed to sufficiently address refugee impact. If a community experiences a new population impact, discretionary funds are available through the unanticipated arrivals standing announcement to address this issue.

Comment: Three commenters recommended that the 20 percent discretionary funding be included in the targeted assistance formula allocation to impacted areas. One commenter felt that this would result in a more equitable distribution of funds and would avoid the administrative costs involved in preparing a grant proposal.

Response: It is the intent of Congress that TAP 20 percent funds be made available to all communities with large concentrations of refugees whose cultural differences make assimilation especially difficult, not just targeted assistance counties.

Comment: One commenter objected to the $19 million set-aside for Cuban/Haitian Entrants, stating that this set-aside allows certain counties to receive a disproportionate share of the funding.

Response: The allocation of Cuban/Haitian set-aside funds is in accordance with Congressional intent as expressed in the Appropriation Committee Reports.

Comment: Three commenters recommended that ORR consider the impact that discontinuing funding will have on areas of high unemployment. Two commenters expressed concern about the effect that the loss of TAP funds will have on counties' abilities to serve refugees. In addition, two commenters expressed concern that the loss of TAP funds will decrease the county's ability to leverage other funds that have been used to provide services to refugees.

Response: 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. It is time, however, to direct targeted assistance funds to those counties that are the most impacted by recent refugee arrivals. Over the past 13 years, the same counties have been receiving targeted assistance, based on arrivals dating back to FY 1980. New ORR regulations require that we now limit our focus on the most recent 5-year arrival populations, which, not surprisingly, shifts the funds to areas with more recent impacts. Such changes to the targeted assistance formula have been discussed with States at a number of meetings over the past two years to ensure that States would understand the effect that the new formula would have and would prepare for the possible loss of funds.

Counties losing targeted assistance formula funds may wish to apply for ORR targeted assistance discretionary funds through their States.

Comment: Two commenters expressed concerns about the application requirements. One commenter felt that offering the TAP funds to the counties would lead the counties to merge TAP with other funds to provide consolidated workforce programs; the commenter felt that such a scenario would detract from the concept of refugee-specific services as supported by ORR. Another commenter asked at what point States can stop applying for TAP funds and have them allocated in the same manner as social service funds. One commenter recommended that ORR allow for a 90-day application period; another commenter recommended that there be a 60-day application period or that there be fewer application requirements,

Response: Section 412(c)(2)(B)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act requires that 95 percent of targeted assistance funds by made available to the county or similar local jurisdiction. States, therefore, must pass the funding down to the qualified county unless the county chooses to rely on the States to administer the targeted assistance program.

Regarding the question about eliminating the need to apply for TAP funds, we have no plans to eliminate this requirement. States that wish to receive targeted assistance funding will continue to have to submit an application for funding in accordance with the application content requirements contained in this notice. Similarly, the receipt of social services formula funds is contingent upon the submission of an approved Annual Services Plan.

A full application is required this year because a number of new counties are eligible for targeted assistance and because 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 1986. Application requirements in the second and third year of a 3-year TAP period will be less extensive. Regarding the time allowed to prepare applications, we plan to allow a longer period of time beginning in FY 1997 for submission of applications.

Comment: One commenter was opposed to requiring the submission of outcome goals in the TAP application since goals which reflect TAP funding will be submitted to ORR every November as part of a State's Annual Outcome Goal Plan. The commenter also felt that goals should reflect changes in funding and other local factors such as the refugee population. The commenter stated that outcomes will decrease if funding decreases.

Response: It is necessary for targeted assistance counties to establish outcome goals as part of their TAP application for two reasons: Not all States that received TAP funds in FY 1995 included TAP-

funded goals in their FY 1996 aggregated Annual Outcome Goal Plans; and HHS grants policy requires grantees to set goals specific to each funding source.

ORR understands that funding levels and other variables must be taken into account when setting and meeting goals. For this reason, we ask States and counties to set goals in terms of percentages of caseload and real numbers. A decrease in funding will likely result in a smaller caseload to be served, but need not necessarily result in a smaller percentage of the caseload entering employment.

Comment: One commenter was opposed to the fact that the notice specifies what must be included in family self-sufficiency plans. The commenter stated that there is no evidence that gathering this information leads to jobs any sooner.

Response: Sections 400.156 and 400.317 of ORR's final rule stipulate that a family self-sufficiency plan must be developed for anyone receiving employment services funded by social services and TAP dollars. We received comments to the proposed rule requesting a definition of a family self-sufficiency plan. Therefore, in response to this request, we defined what we mean by a family self-sufficiency plan in the preamble to the final rule, published on June 28, 1995. The same definition is used in this notice. Contrary to the commenter's view, while there may not be hard evidence that a family self-sufficiency plan, as defined in this notice, leads to earlier employment, there is abundant experiential evidence in the refugee program that the development of such plans assists both the refugee family and the employment counselor to focus more clearly on what steps need to be taken to achieve self-sufficiency. Such plans result ultimately in earlier family self-sufficiency through the attainment of jobs for one or more wage-earners at self-supporting wages.

Comment: One commenter objected to ORR's encouraging States with more than one funded county to place all counties on the same contracting cycle. The commenter stated that until ORR allocates on a Federal fiscal year funding cycle, ORR should not expect States to require counties to operate on the same cycle. Another commenter stated that while having the same start date for all counties would be nice, it would not be able to be accomplished without additional funds in order to avoid a reduction in services.

Response: We are encouraging uniformity of contracting cycles within a State because we believe this makes good management sense and makes reporting less complicated.

Comment: One commenter recommended that TAP funds be allocated to counties within 5 months after being appropriated by Congress. The commenter felt that releasing the funds later keeps counties from accessing funds when they are needed and gives Congress and OMB the impression that the counties do not really need the resources.

Response: We are looking into the feasibility of issuing targeted assistance formula allocations on a quarterly basis, similar to the quarterly allocation of social service formula funds, beginning in FY 1997. Next year, when county eligibility for targeted assistance will not have to be re-determined, we should be able to issue the awards earlier.

Comment: One commenter objected to increasing the county administrative allowance to 15 percent. This commenter felt that counties that have no experience working with refugees will contract out the services to providers that already have contracts with the State, resulting in the same services with added administrative costs. Another commenter expressed support for the increase.

Response: County administrative costs vary in the targeted assistance program. Some counties are able to operate an efficient targeted assistance program with a minimum of administrative costs, while other counties require a higher administrative level of funding to properly manage their targeted assistance program. The increase to 15 percent simply allows for more flexibility in meeting differing administrative cost needs. The increase, however, is not meant to encourage counties to automatically increase their administrative costs, regardless of need.

V. Eligible Grantees

Eligible grantees are those agencies of State governments that are responsible for the refugee program under 45 CFR 400.5 in States containing counties which qualify for FY 1996 targeted assistance awards.

The Director of ORR has determined the eligibility for counties for inclusion in the FY 1996 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 on behalf of all county governments of the qualified counties in that State. Subsequent to the approval of the State's application by ORR, local targeted assistance plans will be developed by the county government or other designated entity and submitted to the State.

A State with more than one qualified county is permitted, but not required, to determine the allocation among for each qualified county within the State. However, if a State chooses to determine county allocations differently from those set forth in this notice, in accordance with § 400.319, the FY 1996 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 1996 targeted assistance funds in a manner different from the formula set forth in this notice, the FY 1996 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 notice are not subject to review by State and areawide clearinghouses under Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.

VI. Qualification and Allocation Formulas

Beginning with FY 1996, ORR has eliminated the formulas used to date for qualification for, and allocation of, targeted assistance funds and replaced them with new formulas in keeping with § 400.315 in ORR's final rule which limits the use of targeted assistance funds to serving refugees who have been in the U.S. 5 years or less.

A. Qualifying New Counties

In order to qualify for application for FY 1996 targeted assistance funds, a county (or group of adjacent counties with the same Standard Metropolitan Statistical area, or SMSA) or independent city is required to rank above a selected cut-off point of jurisdictions for which data were reviewed, based on two criteria: (1) The number of refugee/entrant arrivals placed in the county during the most recent 5-year period (FY 1991—FY 1995); and (2) the 5-year refugee/entrant population as a percent of the county overall population. County arrival numbers have been adjusted based on

updated refugee and entrant arrival data.

Welfare dependency will no longer be used as a qualifying criterion since welfare dependency data for refugee AFDC recipients have not been available at the national level since FY 1989.

Each county was ranked on the basis of its 5-year arrival population and its concentration of refugees, with a relative weighting of 2 to 1 respectively, because we believe that large numbers of refugee/entrant arrivals into a county create a significant impact, regardless of the ratio of refugees to the county general population. The rank of some counties changed slightly due to updated arrival numbers. No county changed its rank sufficiently to change its status from ineligible to eligible.

Each county was then ranked in terms of the sum of a county's rank on refugee arrivals and its rank on concentration. To qualify for targeted assistance, a county had to rank within the top 39 counties. ORR has decided to limit the number of qualified counties to the top 39 counties in order to target a sufficient level of funding to the most impacted counties. Denver County, which had been considered as part of the Denver metropolitan area, in combination with 4 other counties, in the May 6 notice, was ranked as a separate county in the final notice and found to qualify in its own right as the 26th county. The addition of Denver has increased the list of qualified counties from the 38 counties listed in the May 6 notice to 39.

ORR has 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 in this notice. Analysis of these data indicates that: (1) 24 counties which have previously received targeted assistance continue to qualify; (2) 18 counties which have previously received targeted assistance no longer qualify; and (3) 15 new counties qualify.

Table 1 provides a list of the counties that remain qualified and the new counties that qualify, the number of refugee/entrant arrivals in those counties within the past 5 years, the percent that the 5-year arrival population represents of the overall county population, and each county's rank, based on the qualification formula described above.

Table 2 lists the counties that have previously received targeted assistance which no longer qualify, the number of refugee/entrant arrivals in those counties within the past 5 years, the percent that the 5-year arrival population represents of the overall county population, and each county's rank, based on the qualification formula.

The ORR Director plans to determine qualification of counties for targeted assistance funds once every three years. Thus the counties listed in this notice as qualified to apply for FY 1996 TAP funding will remain qualified for TAP funding through FY 1998. ORR does not plan to consider the eligibility of additional counties for TAP funding until FY 1999, when ORR will again review data on all counties that could potentially qualify for TAP funds based on the criteria in this notice. We believe that a more frequent redetermination 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 redetermination of county qualification would pose the risk of not considering new population impacts in a timely manner.

B. Allocation Formula

Of the funds available for FY 1996 for targeted assistance, $25,317,600 is allocated by formula to States for qualifying counties based on the initial placements of refugees, Amerasians, and entrants in these counties during the 5-year period from FY 1991 through FY 1995 (October 1, 1990—September 30, 1995).

At this time, ORR entrant arrival data do not include Cuban parolees who came to the U.S. directly from Havana in FY 1995 under the U.S. Bilateral Agreement with Cuba. Reliable data on these parolees are difficult to obtain since these parolees are not resettled through sponsoring agencies. Only one State was able to provide appropriate documentation to ORR regarding the number of Havana parolee arrivals to that State. We have adjusted the 5-year population to include Havana parolees to that State based on the data it submitted. For those States that were not able to submit documentation on Havana parolee arrivals, we have decided, in the absence of actual data, to credit each qualified TAP county that received entrant arrivals during the 5-year period from FY 1991–FY 1995 with a prorated share of the estimated 10,279 parolees who came to the U.S. directly from Havana in FY 1995. We believe it is a reasonable proxy to base the proration on the percentage of the total 5-year entrant population that each county received. The allocations in this notice reflect these additional parolee numbers.

C. Allocation Formula for Communities Affected by Recent Cuban/Haitian Arrivals

Allocations for recent Cuban and Haitian entrant arrivals are based on entrant arrival numbers during the 5-year period beginning October 1, 1990 through September 30, 1995. Allocations are limited to counties that received 900 or more Cuban and Haitian arrivals during the 5-year period. We have limited allocations to counties with at least 900 entrants to target these resources on the most impacted counties. Counties with 900 or more entrants are eligible for these special funds regardless of whether they qualify for the regular targeted assistance formula program.

VII. Allocations

Table 3 lists the qualifying counties, the number of refugee/entrant arrivals in those counties during the 5-year period from October 1, 1990–September 30, 1995, the prorated number of Havana parolees credited to each county based on the county's proportion of the 5-year entrant population in the U.S., the sum of the first two columns, and the amount of each county's allocation based on its 5-year total population.

Table 4 lists the number of Cuban and Haitian entrant arrivals in each county during FY 1991–FY 1995, the prorated number of Havana parolees credited to each county, the total number of entrants and parolees, and the allocation amount for each county that received 900 or more entrants during the 5-year period.

Table 5 provides State totals for targeted assistance allocations.

Table 6 indicates the areas that each qualified county represents.

TABLE 1.—TOP 39 COUNTIES ELIGIBLE FOR TARGETED ASSISTANCE, TARGETED ASSISTANCE COUNTIES ELIGIBLE FOR CONTINUATION

County and state	5-year arrival pop.	Concentration percent	Rank
Alameda, CA	5,915	0.4624	23
Fresno, CA	6,856	1.0271	8
Merced, CA	1,885	1.0566	38
Orange, CA	26,218	1.0876	4
Sacramento, CA	12,967	1.2454	5
San Diego, CA	13,579	0.5436	14
San Francisco, CA	11,798	0.7357	12
San Joaquin, CA	3,019	0.6281	28
Santa Clara, CA	18,395	1.2283	3
Los Angeles, CA	30,395	0.3429	21
Denver, CO	3,420	0.7314	26
Dade, FL	54,386	2.8076	1
Palm Beach, FL	3,715	0.4302	35
Cook/Kane, IL	18,979	0.3500	22
Suffolk, MA	6,305	0.9497	13
Hennepin, MN	5,324	0.5157	20
Ramsey, MN	4,814	0.9910	15
New York, NY	87,570	1.1959	2
Multnomah, OR	11,463	0.8116	9
Philadelphia, PA	8,643	0.5451	16
Dallas/Tarrant, TX	13,371	0.4423	17
Harris, TX	11,337	0.4023	24
Fairfax, VA	4,848	0.5055	25
King, WA	17,618	0.8930	6
NEW COUNTIES THAT QUALIFY			
District of Columbia	4,460	0.7349	19
Duval, FL	3,282	0.4877	34
De Kalb, GA	5,762	1.0556	11
Fulton, GA	6,581	1.0141	10
Polk, IA	2,784	0.8510	29
City of Baltimore, MD	3,568	0.4848	32
Oakland, MI	4,100	0.3784	39
City of St. Louis, MO	5,442	1.3719	7
Lancaster, NE	2,894	1.3546	18
Bernalillo, NM	2,828	0.5885	37
Broome, NY	2,155	1.0157	36
Monroe, NY	3,495	0.4895	30
Oneida, NY	2,300	0.9169	33
Davidson, TN	3,308	0.6476	27
Richmond, VA	2,165	1.0662	31

TABLE 2.—TARGETED ASSISTANCE COUNTIES THAT NO LONGER QUALIFY

County and state	5-year arrival pop.	Concentration percent	Rank
Contra Costa, CA	1,748	0.2175	85
Tulare, CA	1,110	0.3559	87
Stanislaus, CA	1,258	0.3395	82
Broward, FL	3,703	0.2949	51
Hillsborough, FL	2,863	0.3433	52
Honolulu, HI	1,363	0.1630	111
Sedgwick, KS	1,572	0.3894	68
Orleans, LA	1,259	0.1332	117
Montgomery/Prince Georges, MD	4,530	0.3048	47
Middlesex, MA	3,114	0.2227	61
Jackson, MO	3,234	0.4067	41
Essex, NJ	2,100	0.2699	67
Hudson, NJ	2,761	0.4992	44
Union, NJ	1,221	0.2473	101
Providence, RI	1,389	0.2329	95
Salt Lake, UT	2,957	0.2511	59
Arlington, VA	1,468	0.8588	54
Pierce, WA	2,825	0.4819	46

TABLE 3.—TARGETED ASSISTANCE ALLOCATIONS BY COUNTY: FY 1996

County, state	Arrivals: Refugee+entrant [1] FY 1991–1995	Prorated [2] Havana Parolees	Total arrivals	$25,317,600 Total FY 1996 allocation
ALAMEDA, CA	5,915	3	5,918	$341,304
FRESNO, CA	6,856	0	6,856	395,400
LOS ANGELES, CA	30,395	114	30,509	1,759,519
MERCED, CA	1,885	0	1,885	108.712
ORANGE, CA	26,218	6	26,224	1,512,394
SACRAMENTO, CA	12,967	1	12,968	747,892
SAN DIEGO, CA	13,579	71	13,650	787,224
SAN FRANCISCO, CA	11,798	35	11,833	682,434
SAN JOAQUIN, CA	3,019	1	3,020	174,170
SANTA CLARA, CA	18,395	2	18,397	1,060,994
DENVER, CO	3,420	1	3,421	197,296
DIST OF COLUMBIA, DC	4,460	2	4,462	257,333
DADE, FL	54,386	0	54,386	3,136,556
DUVAL FL	3,282	0	3,282	189,280
PALM BEACH, FL	3,715	0	3,715	214,252
DE KALB, GA	5,762	4	5,766	332,537
FULTON, GA	6,581	31	6,612	381,328
COOK/KANE, IL	18,979	62	19,041	1,098,135
POLK, IA	2,784	0	2,784	160,559
BALTIMORE, MD [3]	3,568	0	3,568	205,774
SUFFOLK, MA	6,305	52	6,357	366,622
OAKLAND, MI	4,100	2	4,102	236,571
HENNEPIN, MN	5,324	0	5,324	307,046
RAMSEY, MN	4,814	2	4,816	277,749
ST LOUIS, MO [3]	5,442	0	5,442	313,852
LANCASTER, NE	2,894	1	2,895	166,961
BERNALILLO, NM	2,828	188	3,016	173,939
BROOME, NY	2,155	5	2,160	124,572
MONROE, NY	3,495	76	3,571	205,947
NEW YORK, NY	87,570	193	87,763	5,061,479
ONEIDA, NY	2,300	0	2,300	132,646
MULTNOMAH, OR	11,463	62	11,525	664,671
PHILADELPHIA, PA	8,643	12	8,655	499,152
DAVIDSON, TN	3,308	0	3,308	190,779
DALLAS/TARRANT, TX	13,371	85	13,456	776,036
HARRIS, TX	11,337	19	11,356	654,925
FAIRFAX, VA	4,848	1	4,849	279,652
RICHMOND, VA	2,165	15	2,180	125,725
KING/SNOHOMISH, WA	17,618	2	17,620	1,016,183
TOTAL	437,944	1,048	438,992	25,317,600

[1] Includes Havana parolees for counties in Florida.
[2] Havana Parollees credited to non-Florida TAP counties based on counties' proportion of the 5 year entrant population in the U.S.
[3] The qualifying local jurisdiction is the independent City of Baltimore and the independent city of St. Louis.

TABLE 4.—TARGETED ASSISTANCE ALOCATIONS FOR COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY RECENT CUBAN AND HAITIAN ARRIVALS: FY 1996

County, state	Entrants [1] FY 1991–1995	Prorated [2] Havana parolees	Entrants [1]+Prorated [2] Havana parolees	Entrants [1]+ Prorated [2] Havana Par. more than 900	$19,000,000 total FY 1996 C/H allocation
ALAMEDA, CA	16	3	19		
FRESNO, CA	0	0	0		
LOS ANGELES, CA	608	114	722		
MERCED, CA	0	0	0		
ORANGE, CA	30	6	36		
SACRAMENTO, CA	3	1	4		
SAN DIEGO, CA	378	71	449		
SAN FRANCISCO, CA	187	35	222		
SAN JOAQUIN, CA	5	1	6		
SANTA CLARA, CA	12	2	14		
DENVER, CO	3	1	4		
DIST OF COLUMBIA, DC	13	2	15		
DADE, FL	42,679	0	42,679	42,679	$15,737,705
DUVAL, FL	35	0	35		
PALM BEACH, FL	2,955	0	2,955	2,955	$1,089,644
DE KALB, GA	19	4	23		
FULTON, GA	165	31	196		

TABLE 4.—TARGETED ASSISTANCE ALOCATIONS FOR COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY RECENT CUBAN AND HAITIAN ARRIVALS: FY 1996—Continued

County, state	Entrants [1] FY 1991–1995	Prorated [2] Havana parolees	Entrants [1]+Prorated [2] Havana parolees	Entrants [1]+ Prorated [2] Havana Par. more than 900	$19,000,000 total FY 1996 C/H allocation
COOK/KANE, IL	331	62	393	0	0
POLK, IA	0	0	0		
BALTIMORE. MD [2]	1	0	1		
SUFFOLK, MA	277	52	329		
OAKLAND, MI	8	2	10		
HENNEPIN, MN	0	0	0		
RAMSEY, MN	8	2	10		
ST LOUIS, MO [2]	1	0	1		
LANCASTER, NE	5	1	6		
BERNALILLO, NM	1,002	188	1,190	1,190	$438,808
BROOME, NY	29	5	34		
MONROE, NY	403	76	479		
NEW YORK, NY	1,029	193	1,222	1,222	450,607
ONEIDA, NY	1	0	1		
MULTNOMAH, OR	329	62	391		
PHILADELPHIA, PA	66	12	78		
DAVIDSON, TN	1	0	1		
DALLAS/TARRANT, TX	452	85	537		
HARRIS, TX	99	19	118		
FAIRFAX, VA	4	1	5		
RICHMOND, VA	82	15	97		
KING/SNOHOMISH, WA	12	2	14		
BROWARD, FL [3]	2,523	0	2,523	2,523	$930,346
HILLSBOROUGH, FL [3]	957	0	957	957	$352,890
TOTAL	54,728	1,048	55,776	51,526	$19,000,000

[1] Includes Havana parolees for counties Florida.
[2] Havana Parolees credited to non-Florida TAP counties based on counties' proportion of the 5 year entrant population in the U.S.
[3] Broward and Hillsborough counties only qualify for the C/H Allocation.

TABLE 5.—TARGETED ASSISTANCE ALLOCATIONS BY STATE: FY 1996

State	$25,317,600 Total FY 1996 allocation	$19,000,000 Total FY 1996 C/H allocation	$44,317,600 Total FY 1996 allocation
California	$7,570,043		$7,570,043
Colorado	197,296		197,296
District of Col.	257,333		257,333
Florida	3,540,088	18,110,585	21,650,673
Georgia	713,865		713,865
Illinois	1,098,135		1,098,135
Iowa	160,559		160,559
Maryland	205,774		205,774
Massachusetts	366,622		366,622
Michigan	236,571		236,571
Minnesota	584,795		584,795
Missouri	313,852		313,852
Nebraska	166,961		166,961
New Mexico	173,939	438,808	612,747
New York	5,524,644	450,607	5,975,251
Oregon	664,671		664,671
Pennsylvania	499,152		499,152
Tennessee	190,779		190,779
Texas	1,430,961		1,430,961
Virginia	405,377		405,377
Washington	1,016,183		1,016,183
Total	25,317,600	19,000,000	44,317,600

TABLE 6.—TARGETED ASSISTANCE AREAS

State	Targeted assistance area [1]	Definition
CA	ALAMEDA	
CA	FRESNO	

TABLE 6.—TARGETED ASSISTANCE AREAS—Continued

State	Targeted assistance area [1]	Definition
CA	LOS ANGELES	
CA	MERCED	
CA	ORANGE	
CA	SACREMENTO	
CA	SAN DIEGO	
CA	SAN FRANCISCO	MARIN, SAN FRANCISCO, & SAN MATEO COUNTIES
CA	SAN JOAQUIN	
CA	SANTA CLARA	
CO	DENVER	
DC	DISTRICT OF COL.	
FL	DADE	
FL	DUVAL	
FL	PALM BEACH	
GA	DEKALB	
GA	FULTON	
IL	COOK/KANE	
IA	POLK	
MD	CITY OF BALTIMORE	
MA	SUFFOLK	
MI	OAKLAND	
MN	HENNEPIN	
MN	RAMSEY	
MO	CITY OF ST. LOUIS	
NE	LANCASTER	
NM	BERNALILLO	
NY	BROOME	
NY	MONROE	
NY	NEW YORK	BRONX, KINGS, NEW YORK, QUEENS, & RICHMOND COUNTIES.
NY	ONEIDA	
OR	MULTNOMAH	CLACKAMAS, MULTNOMAH, & WASHINGTON COUNTIES, OR. & CLARK COUNTY, WA.
PA	PHILADELPHIA	
TN	DAVIDSON	
TX	DALLAS/TARRANT	
TX	HARRIS	
VA	FAIRFAX	FAIRFAX COUNTY & THE INDEPENDENT CITIES OF ALEXANDRIA, FAIRFAX AND FALLS CHURCH.
VA	RICHMOND	
WA	KING/SNOHOMISH	

[1] Consists of named county/counties eligible for the regular Targeted Assistance Formula Grant unless otherwise defined.

VIII. Application and Implementation Process

Under the FY 1996 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 § 400.210(b), FY 1996 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 two years after the end of the Federal fiscal year in which the Department awarded the grant. If final reports are not received on time, the Department will deobligate any unexpended funds, including any unliquidated obligations, on the basis of a State's last filed report.

Although additional funding for communities affected by Cuban and Haitian entrants and refugees whose arrivals in recent years have increased is part of the appropriation amount for targeted assistance, the scope of activities for these additional funds will be administratively determined. Applications for these funds are therefore not subject to provisions contained in this notice but to other requirements which will be conveyed separately. Similarly, the requirements regarding the discretionary portion of the targeted assistance appropriation have been addressed separately in the grant announcement for those funds.

IX. Application Requirements

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

A. Assurance that effective October 1, 1995, targeted assistance funds will be used in accordance with the new ORR regulations published in the Federal Register on June 28, 1995.

B. 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 1996 targeted assistance formula allocation funds that are used for services will be allocated for employment services.

C. 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 programs, e.g. social services, cash and medical assistance, etc.

D. Identification of the local administering agency.

E. The amount of funds to be awarded to the targeted county or counties. If a State with more than one qualifying targeted assistance county chooses to allocate its targeted assistance funds differently from the formula allocation for counties presented in the ORR targeted assistance notice in a fiscal year, its allocations 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 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. The application must provide a description of, and supporting data for, the State's proposed allocation plan, the data to be used, and the proposed allocation for each county.

In instances where a State receives targeted assistance funding for impacted counties contained in a standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) which 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.

F. A description of the State's guidelines for the required content of county targeted assistance plans and a description of the State's review/approval process for such county plans. Acceptable county plans must minimally include the following:

1. Assurance that targeted assistance funds will be used in accordance with the new ORR regulations published in the Federal Register on June 28, 1995. In particular, a description of a county's plan to carry out the requirements of 45 CFR 400.156.

2. Procedures for carrying out a local planning process for determining targeted assistance priorities and service strategies. All local targeted assistance plans will be developed through a planning process that involves, in addition to the State Refugee Coordinator, representatives of the private sector (for example, private employers, private industry council, Chamber of Commerce, etc.), leaders of refugee/entrant community-based organizations, voluntary resettlement agencies, refugees from the impacted communities, and other public officials associated with social services and employment agencies that serve refugees. Counties are encouraged to foster coalition-building among these participating organizations.

3. 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 § 400.314)

4. Description of specific strategies and services to meet the needs of targeted populations. These should be justified where possible through analysis of strategies and outcomes from projects previously implemented under the targeted assistance programs, the regular social service programs, and any other services available to the refugee population.

5. The relationship of targeted assistance services to other services available to refugees/entrants in the county including State-allocated ORR social services.

6. Analysis of available employment opportunities in the local community. Examples of acceptable analyses 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.

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

8. 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. Beginning with FY 1996 funds, 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 clients.

9. For any State that administers the program directly or otherwise provides direct service to the refugee/entrant population (with the concurrence of the county), the State must provide ORR with the same information required above for review and prior approval.

G. All applicants must establish targeted assistance proposed performance goals for each of the 6 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 6 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 which are currently grantees for targeted assistance funds should base projected annual outcome goals on past performance. Current grantees should have adequate baseline data for at least 3 of the 6 ORR performance outcome measures (entered employments, 90 day retentions, and average wage at placement) based on a long history (in some cases, as much as 12 years) of targeted assistance program experience. Where baseline data do not exist for a specific performance outcome measure, current grantees should use available performance data from the current targeted assistance funding cycle to establish reasonable outcome goals for contractors and sub-grantees on all 6 measures.

States identified as new eligible targeted assistance grantees are also required to set proposed outcome goals for each of the 6 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.

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.

H. An identification of the contracting cycle dates for targeted assistance service contracts in each county. States with more than one qualified county are encouraged to ensure that all counties participating in TAP in the State use the same contracting cycle dates.

I. 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.

J. 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, except in the case of a State that administers the program locally as described in item F9 above.

K. 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 add up to, but not exceed, 10% of the county's TAP allocation to the State's administrative budget.

L. Assurance that the State will follow or mandate that its sub-recipients will follow appropriate State procurement and contract requirements in the acquisition, administration, and management of targeted assistance service contracts.

X. 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 new ORR–6 Quarterly Performance Report form which was sent to States in ORR State Letter 95–35 on November 6, 1995.

Dated: July 8, 1996.

Lavinia Limon,

Director, Office of Refugee Resettlement.

[FR Doc. 96–17808 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184–01–P–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–3778–N–93]

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development; Federal Property Suitable as Facilities To Assist the Homeless

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

ACTION: Notice.

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 12, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Johnston, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Room 7256, 451 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20410; telephone (202) 708–1226; TDD number for the hearing- and speech-impaired (202) 708–2565, (these telephone numbers are not toll-free), or call the toll-free Title V information line at 1–800–927–7588.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with the December 12, 1988 court order in *National Coalition for the Homeless* versus *Veterans Administration,* No. 88–2503–OG (D.D.C.), HUD publishes a notice, on a weekly basis, identifying unutilized, underutilized, excess and surplus Federal buildings and real property that HUD has reviewed for suitability for use to assist the homeless. Today's notice is for the purpose of announcing that no additional properties have been determined suitable or unsuitable this week.

Dated: July 5, 1996.

Jacquie M. Lawing,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Development.

[FR Doc. 96–17560 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–29–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[CO–030–06–1610–00–1784]

Southwest Resource Advisory Council Meetings

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; Resource Advisory Council Meetings.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 USC), notice is hereby given that the Southwest Resource Advisory Council (SW RAC) will meet on Wednesday, August 14, 1996, in the See Forever Room in the Miramonte Building, 333 West Colorado Avenue, Telluride, Colorado, and on Thursday, September 12, 1996, at the Gunnison County Fairgrounds Multi-Purpose Building, 275 South Spruce, Gunnison, Colorado.

DATES: The meetings will be held on Wednesday, August 14, 1996, and on Thursday, September 12, 1996. Both meetings will begin at 9:00 a.m. and end at 4:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: For additional information, contact Roger Alexander, Bureau of Land Management, Montrose District Office, 2465 South Townsend Avenue, Montrose, Colorado 81401; Telephone 970–249–7791; TDD 970–249–4639.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The August 14, 1996, meeting is scheduled to begin at 9:00 a.m. in the See Forever Room in the Miramonte Building, 333 West Colorado Avenue, Telluride, Colorado. The agenda will focus on management of the San Miguel River corridor and will include a tour of the San Miguel River Area of Critical Environmental Concern/Special Recreation Management Area. Time will be provided for public comments. Field trip participants must provide their own transportation.

The Thursday, September 12, 1996, is scheduled to begin at 9:00 a.m. at the Gunnison County Fairgrounds Multi-Purpose Building, 275 South Spruce, Gunnison, Colorado. This will be a joint meeting with the Gunnison Sage Grouse Working Group and the agenda will focus on the management of sage grouse in southwestern Colorado. Time will be provided for public comments.

All Resource Advisory Council meetings are open to the public. Interested persons may make oral statements to the Council, or written statements may be submitted for the Council's consideration. Depending on the number of persons wishing to make oral statements, a per-person time limit may be established by the Montrose District Manager.

Summary minutes for Council meetings are maintained in the Montrose District Office and are available for public inspection and reproduction during regular business hours within thirty (30) days following each meeting.

Dated: July 5, 1996.

Mark W. Stiles,

District Manager.

[FR Doc. 96–17705 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–JB–P

[CA–066–06–1610–00]

Emergency Area Closure to the Discharge of Firearms, San Diego County, CA

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Emergency area closure to the discharge of firearms on BLM-managed public lands, San Diego County, California.

SUMMARY: Under the authority of 43 CFR 8364.1 (a), notice is hereby given that an emergency area closure to the discharge of firearms is in effect on BLM-managed