NTP Executive Committee, will be informed of this action. The original petitioner will be notified of the RG1 action and invited to resubmit the petition with additional justification. All petitioned agents, substances, or mixtures reviewed by RG1 but not selected for listing or delisting will be included in the subsequent edition of the RoC with the reason(s) why they were not considered further.

*NTP Executive Committee's Interagency Working Group for the Report on Carcinogens (RG2)*

The second review phase of petitions will be done by the NTP Executive Committee's Interagency Working Group for the Report on Carcinogens (RG2). RG2 is a Governmental interagency group that assesses whether relevant information on the petitioned agent, substance, or mixture is available and sufficient for listing in or delisting from the RoC. A reviewer for each petition will be assigned from the RG2 who will be responsible for reviewing the draft document and for leading the Working Group's discussion of the petition. Public comments received in response to announcements of petitions will also be considered by RG2 during the review. Upon completion of its review, RG2 will provide comments and recommendations for any changes and/or additions to the draft document and also make its recommendation for listing or delisting. The petition then continues through the review process.

*Board of Scientific Counselors RoC Subcommittee (External Peer Review)*

The third review phase for petitions will be performed by a subcommittee of the NTP Board of Scientific Counselors. This subcommittee serves as another independent peer review group that assesses whether the relevant information available is sufficient for listing in or delisting. The NTP Board RoC Subcommittee will review petitions in a public meeting. Prior to public review, a notice will be published in the **Federal Register**, trade journals, and NTP publications, soliciting public comment. The notice will also invite interested groups or individuals to submit written comments and/or to address the NTP Board RoC Subcommittee during the review meeting. Reviewers for each petition will be assigned from the NTP Board RoC Subcommittee who will be responsible for reviewing the draft document and leading the subcommittee's discussion of the petition. Upon completion of its review, NTP Board RoC Subcommittee will provide comments and recommendations for any changes and/or additions to the draft document and also make its formal recommendation for listing or delisting the petitioned agent, substance, or mixture.

Upon completion of the reviews by RG1, RG2, and NTP Board RoC Subcommittee, those petitioned agents, substances, mixtures, or exposure circumstance which are recommended for listing in or delisting from the RoC, will be published in the **Federal Register**, trade journals, and NTP publications, and public comment and input on the recommendations will be solicited.

*NTP Executive Committee*

The independent recommendations of RG1, RG2, and NTP Board RoC Subcommittee and all public comment will be presented to the NTP Executive Committee [2] for review and comment.

*NTP Director*

The Director, NTP receives the four independent recommendations from RG1, RG2, NTP Board RoC Subcommittee, and the NTP Executive Committee and makes the final decision regarding the proposed listing and/or delisting and submits the RoC to the Office of the Secretary, DHHS. Upon review and approval by the Secretary, DHHS and submission to Congress, a notice of the RoC publication, indicating all newly listed or delisted agents, substances, mixtures, or exposure circumstance will be published in the **Federal Register**, trade journals, and NTP publications.

**Report on Carcinogens; Criteria for Listing Agents, Substances or Mixtures**

*1. Known To Be Human Carcinogens*

There is sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity from studies in humans which indicates a causal relationship between exposure to the agent, substance or mixture and human cancer.

*2. Reasonably Anticipated To Be Human Carcinogens*

There is limited evidence of carcinogenicity from studies in humans which indicates that causal interpretation is credible but that alternative explanations such as chance, bias or confounding factors could not adequately be excluded; *or*

There is sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity from studies in experimental animals which indicates there is an increased incidence of malignant and/or a combination of malignant and benign tumors: (1) In multiple species, or at multiple tissue sites, or (2) by multiple routes of exposure, or (3) to an unusual degree with regard to incidence, site or type of tumor or age at onset; *or*

There is less than sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in humans or laboratory animals, however; the agent, substance or mixture belongs to a well defined, structurally-related class of substances whose members are listed in a previous Report on Carcinogens as either a known to be human carcinogen, or reasonably anticipated to be human carcinogen or there is convincing relevant information that the agent acts through mechanisms indicating it would likely cause cancer in humans.

Conclusions regarding carcinogenicity in humans or experimental animals are based on scientific judgment, with consideration given to all relevant information. Relevant information includes, but is not limited to dose response, route of exposure, chemical structure, metabolism, pharmacokinetics, sensitive sub populations, genetic effects, or other data relating to mechanism of action or factors that may be unique to a given substance. For example, there may be substances for which there is evidence of carcinogenicity in laboratory animals but there are compelling data indicating that the agent acts through mechanisms which do not operate in humans and would therefore not reasonably be anticipated to cause cancer in humans.

Dated: September 29, 1999.

**Kenneth Olden,**

*Director, National Toxicology Program.*

[FR Doc. 99–25940 Filed 10–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

[2] Agencies represented on the NTP Executive Committee include: Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), National Center for Toxicological Research (NCTR), National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), National Institutes of Health (NIH), National Cancer Institute (NCI), National Library of Medicine (NLM), and National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences/NTP (NIEHS/NTP).

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

In compliance with section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 concerning opportunity for public comment on

proposed collections of information, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service Administration will publish periodic summaries of proposed projects. To request more information on the proposed projects or to obtain a copy of the information collection plans, call the SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer on (301) 443–7978.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collections of information are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

**Proposed Project**

State Incentive Grant (SIG) Cross-Site Evaluation—SAMHSA's Center for Substance Abuse prevention (CSAP) is charged with evaluating the State Incentive Cooperative Agreements for Community-Based Action, or State Incentive Grant (SIG) Program. States receiving SIG funds are: (1) To coordinate, leverage and/or redirect, as appropriate, all substance abuse prevention resources within the State that are directed at communities, families, schools, and workplaces, and (2) to develop a revitalized, comprehensive State-wide prevention strategy aimed at reducing drug use by youth. The ultimate aim of the SIG Program is to prevent substance abuse among youths ages 12 to 17. The District of Columbia and the 20 States that have received SIG grants thus far are required to implement at the community level a range of substance abuse, community-based prevention efforts, at least half of which are derived from sound scientific research findings. CSAP awarded about $3 million per year for three years to each of five States in FY 1997, to each of fourteen States in FY 1998, and to one State and the District of Columbia in FY 1999.

CSAP is planning a national, cross-site evaluation of the SIG Program, consisting of a process and an outcome evaluation. The outcome evaluation will address two questions: (1) ''Has the SIG Program had an impact on youth substance abuse?,'' and (2) ''How do SIG States differ in their impact on youth substance abuse?'' These questions will be addressed by using data already being collected by SAMHSA's National Household Survey of Drug Abuse (NHSDA). The process evaluation will focus on three questions: (1) ''Did States attain the SIG Program's two main goals of coordinated funding streams and revitalized comprehensive prevention strategies and how were these goals attained?,'' (2) ''What other substance abuse prevention programming has the State implemented?,'' and (3) ''Did SIGs meet the criterion of supporting science-based programs fifty percent of the time, and what array of prevention activities were supported?''

In addition to the NHSDA data, three instruments are needed to collect process information about SIG activities at the State, community, and program levels: (1) A State Case Study Protocol; (2) a Comparison State Protocol and (3) a Program Intervention Protocol. The State Case Study Protocol will collect data on the following topics at the State level: contextual conditions, SIG mobilization, system characteristics and dynamics, collaborative strategies or activities, immediate outcomes, systems change, sub-recipient characteristics and dynamics, sub-recipient planning and science-based prevention interventions, sub-recipient immediate local outcomes, long-term outcomes, possible rival explanations, and learned lessons. The State Case Study Protocol also will provide data for one of the two Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures for the SIG program. The Comparison State Protocol will collect data from non-SIG States to identify any SIG-like interventions and to record State-level contextual conditions and the characteristics of prevention systems. The Program Intervention Protocol will collect data at the subrecipient and program levels on the following topics: contextual conditions, program or action definition, and immediate and intermediate outcomes.

The State Case Study Protocol will be used once for every State-level SIG award. The Comparison State Protocol will be administered once to all States and U.S. territories not participating in the SIG Program. The Program Intervention Protocol will be used for a sample of sub-recipient communities and programs in the SIG States.

Estimated annual burden is as follows:

| Instrument | Number of respondents | Responses per respondent | Hours per response | Annual burden |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| State Case Study Protocol | 56 | 1 | 2 | 112 |
| Comparison State Protocol | 25 | 1 | 2 | 50 |
| Program Intervention Protocol | 240 | 1 | 1 | 240 |
| Total | 321 | ..... | ..... | 402 |

Send comments to Nancy Pearce, SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer, Room 16–105, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Dated: September 29, 1999.

**Richard Kopanda,**

*Executive Officer, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99–25962 Filed 10–5–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4162–20–M**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

**[Docket No. FR–4410–FA–07]**

### Announcement of Funding Awards for Fiscal Year 1999 Community Outreach Partnership Centers

**AGENCY:** Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, HUD.

**ACTION:** Announcement of funding awards.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with section 102(a)(4)(C) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989, this document notifies the public of funding awards for Fiscal Year 1999 Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program. The purpose of this document is to announce the names and addresses of the award winners and the amount of the awards which are to be used to establish and operate Community Outreach Partnership Centers that will conduct competent and qualified