The Service has determined that there are no known areas which have the necessary requirements to be determined Critical Habitat, as defined in 50 CFR 402.02, for the bonytail chub. This determination is based on the fact that there are no known habitat sites for breeding, reproduction and rearing of offspring.

The primary author of this rule is Dr. James D. Williams, Office of Endangered Species, 703/235-1975.

Note.—The Department has determined that this is not a significant rule and does not require the preparation of a regulatory analysis under Executive Order 12044 and 43 CFR 14.

The Service now proceeds with this final rulemaking to determine this species as Endangered under the authority contained in the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.

Regulations Promulgation

Accordingly, Part 17 Subparts B and I, Title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations are amended as set forth below:

§ 17.11 Endangered and threatened wildlife.

1. Section 17.11 is amended by adding, in alphabetical order, the following to the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife.

Species		Historic range	Vertebrate population where endangered or threatened	Status	When listed	Critical habitat	Special rules
Common name	Scientific name						
Chub, bonytail	*Gila elegans*	Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming.	Entire	E		NA	NA

Dated: April 18, 1980.

Lynn A. Greenwalt,

Director, Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 80-12416 Filed 4-22-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-M

federal register

Wednesday
April 23, 1980

Part IV

Department of Justice

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Delinquency Prevention Research and Development; Response to Public Comment and Notice of Issuance of Program Announcement

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Response to Public Comment and Notice of Issuance of LEAA Program Announcement Delinquency Prevention Research and Development

AGENCY: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA).

ACTION: Response to public comment and notice of issuance.

SUMMARY: This guideline is an addition to the National Priority Program and Discretionary Program Announcement, published in the **Federal Register** on February 15, 1980. It does not in any way impact upon the programs or regulations presently set out in that announcement or affect the eligibility of those individuals applying for previously announced programs.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 1980, a draft Program Announcement of competitive action grants for a Delinquency Prevention Research and Development initiative. This notice summarizes the public comments received pertaining to the draft announcement, responds to the issues raised, details the changes made and sets forth the final program guideline.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Kathie Costin, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20531, (202) 724-7776

Ira M. Schwartz,

Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Nature of Comments and LEAA's Response

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has received two (2) responses to the Delinquency Prevention Research and Development (R&D) draft program announcement, which was published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 1980.

Both respondents represented private non-profit human service organizations and both indicated general concurrence with the type of research and development program proposed. The respondents offered the following suggestions for substantive changes in the program announcement:

1. *Target Population*

Comment—Selection of a target population of elementary and middle school children would reduce resistence to the changes intended. Such a population would hold more promise for the initial testing of this research effort.

OJJDP Response—OJJDP agrees with the respondent that secondary school systems appear to have the greatest percentage of school discipline problems and that students in secondary grades are likely to be victims of unequal treatment. Secondary school systems are bound by complex and traditional procedures that are not easily modified. They often evidence student violence, discontent and inadequate delivery of educational assistance. It is precisely for this reason that OJJDP has chosen secondary schools as the most appropriate target for a research and development effort involving organizational change strategies. Primary and elementary school systems, which the respondent cites as holding promise for delinquency prevention testing, will be included among the target populations of the first part of the Prevention R&D program, a test of a comprehensive model of delinquency prevention.

2. *Desired Project Forms*

Comment—Care should be taken to ensure that funds awarded through this program do not substitute mandated or normal educational activities, but are used to facilitate the improvement, change or expansion of educational developmental programs for youth.

OJJDP Response—OJJDP shares the respondent's concern. Since OJJDP is not requesting applicants to develop detailed program designs or implementation procedures in their applications, this concern is not discussed in the program announcement. The development of each grantee's program will be joint effort undertaken by the grantee and OJJDP. The implementation process will be carefully controlled and monitored.

3. *Strategies for Attracting School System Participation*

Comment—Applicants will need the bargaining power which direct services and financial flexibility can offer, in order to attract the participation of school systems.

OJJDP Response—The applicants will be the school systems themselves. There will be flexibility within the program budgets so that school districts will have bargaining power to introduce change concepts. However, OJJDP believes that the availability of large sums of money to be used for this purpose may encourage the development of programs which are not easily supported by local schools or school systems, which would limit potential transferability.

4. *Limiting the Program to Primary Prevention Strategies*

Comment—The definition of secondary delinquency prevention is not consistent with the structural theoretical perspectives we propose to test. Programs which address populations of youth at risk place the cause of delinquency in the individual rather than the social structure (i.e., the concept of pre-delinquency).

OJJDP Response—Delinquency research has identified factors (social and individual) which are related to involvement in delinquent behavior. Thus, secondary prevention interventions are aimed at *groups* of youth who manifest conditions likely to make them more vulnerable for involvement in delinquent activities. These types of interventions *do not* rely on previous behavior patterns as selection criteria for participation. Rather it is recognized that specialized efforts must be made to involve vulnerable youth in the context of developing school-based programs for all youth.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Program Announcement Delinquency Prevention Research and Development

Pursuant to Section 243 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is sponsoring a program of research in delinquency prevention. The sole aim of this program is to obtain rigorous evaluation research results on the particular delinquency prevention approaches described within this announcement.

A. *Background.* In response to the legislative mandate to develop effective approaches for preventing delinquency, OJJDP commissioned the preparation of two major sets of materials on the state-of-the-art of delinquency prevention. One set was prepared to guide states in using Federal funds to develop state-wide prevention strategies. It consists of a review of academic, professional and popular views about causes of delinquency, and identifies directions that appear promising for preventing delinquency. This material is contained in a volume entitled *Delinquency Prevention: Theories and Strategies.*

The OJJDP Assessment Center on Delinquent Behavior and its Prevention was also commissioned to review and analyze the theoretical and empirical literature on causes of delinquent behavior, and to review studies of the effectiveness of various approaches to

preventing delinquency. The Center also undertook a nationwide survey of existing prevention programs. The results of the review and survey efforts were utilized to develop a design for a comprehensive model of delinquency prevention which is outlined in a paper entitled "The Social Development Model: An Integrated Approach to Delinquency Prevention."

The Prevention Research and Development Program consists of two parts. The first is a test in one community of the comprehensive model designed by the Assessment Center, which focuses on the family, school, peer groups and employment. The second part involves a test of school-based prevention strategies in selected communities, based upon the most promising strategies identified in *Delinquency Prevention: Theories and Strategies*, which are compatible with the school-based components of the comprehensive model. *This solicitation invites applications to test the second part of the Delinquency Prevention Program.*

OJJDP has available a limited supply of the referenced background material. Copies will be mailed to persons interested in applying for this program upon written request as long as the supply lasts.

B. *Program Objective.* 1. To implement in four (4) to six (6) sites, a chosen set of primary and secondary prevention programs which deliberately and systematically apply certain contemporary delinquency theories and research findings.

2. To apply rigorous experimental and quasi-experimental evaluation research designs to the programs implemented in order to:

a. Assess the impact of the programs on delinquent behavior and some closely related variables;

b. Assess the effectiveness of the various program elements; and

c. Add to the understanding of processes which generate delinquent behavior and how such behavior can be reduced.

C. *Programs to be Tested.* The approaches to be tested under this program have already been selected. Applications to develop and test these approaches, not departures from them, are invited. Potential applicants should bear in mind that OJJDP considers the production of high quality evaluation research findings to be the sole purpose of this program. For certain potential applicants this program will present a rare opportunity for rigorous program development and testing. Agencies or organizations primarily interested in augmenting services may find this program to be a troublesome and awkward source of support, given the rigorous research and evaluation requirements.

D. *Program Description.* Through this program, OJJDP will test selected primary and secondary delinquency prevention strategies. For purposes of this announcement, primary prevention includes programs which alter fundamental conditions or institutional arrangements *or* which address all youth in a target school or school system in order to preclude delinquent behavior and to forestall processes by which youth may come to assume delinquent roles and lifestyles. Secondary delinquency prevention includes programs which address populations of youth which may, on adequate evidence, be regarded as being at greater than normal risk of engaging in delinquent behavior or of assuming delinquent roles and lifestyles.

1. *Central Characteristics of Selected Programs.* The desired primary and secondary prevention programs share some central characteristics intended to make them attempt to reduce the original incidence of delinquent behavior rather than to react to troublesome behavior which is already visible.

a. Both the primary and secondary prevention programs employ contemporary delinquency theory to interpret organizational and group arrangements and processes conducive to delinquent behavior and to the assumption of delinquent roles by youth. Both employ this interpretation selectively to alter or counteract these arrangements or processes.

b. Neither the primary nor secondary programs to be tested employ individual diagnosis, screening or treatment to any significant degree. Rather, the aim is to intervene in arrangements and processes affecting classes of youth. In the secondary prevention programs, limited use may be made of individual assessments and treatments but only as supplements to the central activities.

c. Neither the primary nor the secondary prevention programs should address youth who are, at the time, engaged in proceedings with, or in the custody of, juvenile justice agencies. In general, programs which operate primarily as responses to individual youths' histories of delinquent behavior are not desired, and will not be regarded as responsive to this announcement.

2. *Theoretical Orientation.* In order to provide a distinctive focus for these programs and to attain desirable depth and rigor in the program design and evaluation, the desired delinquency prevention programs will apply a few selected theoretical arguments about delinquent behavior. Both the validity of the theoretical arguments and the programmatic application of the arguments will be addressed in the evaluation component of this program.

Social control (Reiss, 1951; Nye, 1958; Matza, 1964; Hirschi, 1969) is the major theory to be tested through this program. Control theory postulates that delinquency occurs because it is not prevented by development of a strong bond to the social order. This bond is characterized by attachment to parents and school, commitment to educational and occupational success and belief in the legitimacy and moral validity of the law. Youngsters who do not become bonded to the social order in these ways because of inadequate or incomplete socialization are likely to engage in delinquent behavior. Thus, efforts to increase the effectiveness of schools in the process of socialization and social bonding of youths are consistent with control theory. The control theoretical perspective will be augmented selectively by social learning theory (Akers, 1974), cultural deviance theory (Miller, 1957; Sutherland and Cressy, 1966); strain or opportunity theory (Merton, 1937; Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960) and labeling theory (Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1972). Discussions of each of these theories can be found in the background materials for this announcement.

E. *General Program Approach.* The basic method of these delinquency prevention programs is to employ specific theory and research findings to identify and interpret organizational and group processes contributing to delinquent behavior, and then to move selectively to remove, reduce or counteract those contributors, or to create new opportunities for better social bonding. Programs will establish organizational or group routines in which socialization and social bonding are increased and systematic supports for law-abiding behavior are strengthened so that delinquent behavior is prevented.

The approach outlined here will be tested in schools. The target population will be youth in grades 6 through 10, although the program forms may be implemented on a school-wide basis for junior high and high schools.

F. *Program Strategy.* This program announcement is designed to provide potential applicants with general information on the approach to the Delinquency Prevention Research and Development program, and to initiate a program development process. Applicants are asked to assess their capability to participate in the effort,

and to assess the feasibility of applying the approach outlined above in their jurisdiction.

Simultaneously, OJJDP will be undertaking development activities to give more specific direction to the program. OJJDP will be convening a small working group to review the materials discussed in the background section of this announcement, to specify the theoretical framework and the hypotheses to tested, and to identify the range of specific school-based program components to be implemented in local school systems.

The results of this process will be shared with successful applicants through the technical assistance efforts sponsored by OJJDP in support of this initiative. The OJJDP technical assistance contractor and the evaluation grantee will assist grantees in incorporating selected components into their first-year plans.

G. *Desired Project Forms.* The desired strategies can be implemented in either of two main forms: direct efforts toward organizational change *or* more conventional programs of direct services to selected youth populations. Organizational change strategies are preferred.

1. Direct efforts toward selective organizational change (see *Delinquency Prevention: Theories and Strategies,* Chapter 3).

In this form, the applicant selects for attention a school or a group of schools. The theoretical framework will be applied to identify and interpret organizational and group arrangements in schools which inhibit social bonding to school, teachers and law-abiding peers, and which thereby limit the school's effectiveness in controlling delinquent behavior. Then, programs to modify the subject organizational and group arrangements are designed and implemented, employing the selected prevention strategies. Organizational change is the direct product. Such change is likely to be complementary to broader aims of improving schooling. The central aim is to affect delinquent behavior by augmenting the school's role in the social bonding process and hence its effectiveness in preventing delinquency.

2. Programs of direct service to selected youth populations (see *Delinquency Prevention: Theories and Strategies,* Chapter 4).

The design and implementation of selective school organizational changes of the type described above may not be feasible in some jurisdictions. Therefore a second and less preferred form may be attempted either as a primary or a secondary prevention program. This second form is accomplished by identifying legitimate activities in the school which apply the theoretical framework and strategies of this research and development program and which can therefore be expected to enhance the grounds for bonding.

These selected activities are to be made available to some population of youth. If primary prevention is selected, the activity would include a cross-section of all youth. If secondary prevention is selected, it would include a mix of *all* youth, although particular efforts should be made to recruit groups of youth which stand a greater than normal risk of engaging in delinquent behavior.

In this form, the basic or on-going activities of the program would be supported by the school as a normal part of its operations.

Program elements which are consistent with the theoretical approaches of interest and with *both* of the forms described above include "performance-based education" (sometimes referred to as "mastery learning"), school-based opportunities for work and community service including experience-based career education, increased student participation in school governance and in the planning and development of school activities, and joint family and school efforts in socialization and education. Applicants should assess their capability to implement these types of components in their applications.

Applicants who select the direct service form should bear in mind that even this form should contribute to long-term organizational development. (See *Delinquency Prevention: Theories and Strategies,* Chapter/Section 4.10.)

As a support for, but not as a replacement for, the two program types described, limited, remedial components relying primarily on individual assessment may be including within secondary prevention programs.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate their capability to implement one of these two programs forms. Applications should indicate which of the two forms of programs is likely to be implemented, but should not develop the program design or implementation design in detail.

H. *Duration of Grants and Funding Levels.* Awards will be made under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 as amended. Grantees will not be required to provide matching funds. Projects will receive funds for a period of two years, with the intention of providing a third year for all projects initially approved and making satisfactory progress, providing that funds are available.

Since programs of the type desired cannot be adequately designed and proposed in the period available for proposal preparation, applications will be used primarily by OJJDP to assess applicant capability and the feasibility of implementing the program in the local jurisdiction.

Applications should address a three-year time period which allows for the following:

1. *Year One.* The first year following grant award will be devoted to systematic and detailed planning, negotiation, design and development of the intended program and to planning for and collection of baseline data for the evaluation program. First year budgets may not exceed $75,000. These funds may be used to defray design and development costs, including program coordination, negotiation of detailed agreements with necessary organizations, time for staff to participate in training, program design, development anmd testing of materials and methods, training of relevant staff in the theoretical underpinnings of the program and specialized consultation and assistance. Travel funds should be designated for quarterly trips to Washington, DC, to confer with other program grantees, the government project monitor, technical assistance contractor and the program evaluator.

OJJDP anticipates that the grantee will wish to appoint project directors to lead the development activities of the first year and manage implementation in the second and third years. The Project Director should be an experienced, knowledgeable and influential member of the applicant's staff who is in a favorable organizational position to apply these methods. If the applicant proposed to hire a Project Director not presently a member of the staff, sufficient justification must be submitted as part of the application. At a mimimum, the Project Director must have organizational change skills and an orientation to innovation. The core staff must include research expertise.

The products for the first year should be:

a. A complete, detailed, well-developed and rehearsed strategy and program design which is ready to be implemented in the second year and which is well integrated with the evaluation design. The design will be prepared by the grantee with the assistance of OJJDP to insure its consistency with the theoretical framework and its evaluability.

b. A thorough narrative report of the development activities.

c. Thorough documentation of relevant variables needed for the evaluation developed in conjunction with the evaluator.

Continued participation during Year Two will be contingent on OJJDP approval of the strategy and program design developed during Year One. The design must identify the hypotheses to be tested, the specific activities to be undertaken, how these relate to the hypotheses, and the theoretical framework, the administrative and organizational arrangements for carrying out the project activities, and a detailed workplan for the implementation of project activities. Evaluation required must be built into the design and implementation of the project. Projects which are unable to develop an acceptable strategy and design will be terminated at the end of the first year.

2. *Year Two.* The programs designed and rehearsed in the first year will be implemented in the second year. OJJDP expects second year budgets not to exceed 150,000. Given the intent to base these projects within existing organizations, OJJDP expects that the bulk of operational costs will be borne locally. Because this is a testing program, there will be a continuing need for the grantees to address design, program development and organizational development throughout the second year. Therefore, a substantial portion of the second year budget must be devoted to activities such as staff training, consultation, progress review, necessary revision of materials, review of the theoretical framework, data collection for collection purposes, etc.

OJJDP is aware that there may be exceptions to the principle that operational costs must be borne locally. Use of some portion of the second year funds to defray operational costs will be reviewed and approved by OJJDP based upon the following considerations:

a. In the first year, the project staff made serious, systematic attempts to base the program in local resources.

b. The operational expense is necessary to obtain evaluative information regarding project impact on delinquent behavor and intervening variables included in the program model.

c. Costs are one-time costs of change or, if the costs are on-going, there is assurance that they will be assumed by the local organization in a short period of time.

The products for the second year should be:

a. A through, descriptive report of the second year's experience.

b. A report developed in conjunction with the evaluator of the evaluation of program intervention and effects on school practices and youth after one year of intervention.

3. *Year Three.* Based upon the availability of funds and demonstration of satisfactory progress during the initial funding period, grantees may be awarded third year funding.

During this final funding period, grantees will continue to refine and improve the existing program in light of the second year's experience and in response to the preliminary evaluation results. Particular consideration must be given to the consolidation and permanent establishment of the program if the evaluation results are favorable.

Once again, the grantee must give substantial attention and resources to the problems of organizational development and program development, refinement, research and evaluation, and renewal. If operational costs have been covered with grant funds during the second year, the third year allocation for this purpose should be eliminated or greatly reduced. The grantee should begin during the third year to assume the costs for project.

In summary, OJJDP intends to provide an opportunity for a theory-based, systemmatic Research and Development Program. OJJDP expects that this program will result in:

1. Careful, well-supported implementation of specific program components.

2. Thorough evaluation of the entire process and its outcomes.

3. Institutionalization of programs which are determined to be effective.

I. *Evaluation.* Since this is a research and development program, the evaluation will be a major, intergral component. Each project will be expected to adhere strictly to the requirements of the design to be developed by an independent evaluator. These requirements are likely to include random selection porocedures follow-up of youth involved in the programs, access to school, police and court records, and detailed documentation of the project activities. The evaluation design will be developoed in conjunction with the program development process explained in Paragraph F, *Program Strategy.* The technical assistance contractor will work with the evaluator to assist the projects in implementing procedures which meet evaluation requirements.

J. *Technical Assistance.* Technical assistance will be provided to successful applicants at each stage of program development, including application refinement, implementation and evaluation. The technical assistance provider will work with OJJDP in prioritizing the technical assistance needs, and the provider will be required to provide a timely, planned response to those technical assistance requests which can be accommodated. The provider will also submit written reports of technical assistance to the project staff, to OJJDP and to the evaluator.

K. *Eligibility.* Eligibility for this program is limited to schools and school districts or other organizations which, by virtue of extraordinary circumstances, relationships or competencies, are in a position to implement the described programs in the manner set out in this announcement.

L. *Civil Rights Compliance Requirements.* 1. All recipients of LEAA assistance must comply with:

a. Section 815(c) of the Justice System Improvements Act (JSIA), and its implementing regulations, found at 28 C.F.R. 42.201, *et seq.*

b. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and its implementing regulation, found at 28 C.F.R. 42.101, *et seq.*

c. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation act of 1973, as amended, and its implementing regulations.

d. The Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, and its implementing regulations.

e. Executive Order 12138, 44 F.R. 29637 (May 22, 1979), requiring recipients of Federal financial assistance to take appropriate affirmative action in support of women's business enterprise.

2. Each recipient of LEAA assistance within the criminal justice system which has 50 or more employees and which has received grants or subgrants totaling $25,000 or more since the enactment of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, and which has a service population with a minority representation of 3% or more is required to formulate, implement and maintain an Equal Employment Opportunity Program (EEOP). Where a recipient has 50 or more employees, and has received grants of subgrants of $25,000 or more, and has a service population with a minority representation of less than 3%, such recipient is required to formulate, implement and maintain an EEOP relating to employment practices affecting women. This requirement shall be satisfied prior to the award. An applicant for LEAA assistance for $500,000 or more must submit its EEOP with the application. *The EEOP must be approved by OJARS' Office of Civil Rights Compliance prior to award.* Failure to address this requirement will result in rejection of the proposal.

3. Applicants that do not meet any of the criteria in paragraph 2, above, educational institutions and private not-for-profit organizations shall maintain such records and submit to the OJJDP upon request timely, complete and accurate data establishing the fact that no person or persons will be or have been denied or prohibited from participation in, benefits of, or denied or prohibited from obtaining employment in connection with any program activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this program because of their race, national origin, sex, religion, handicap or age. In the case of any program under which a primary recipient of Federal funds extends financial assistance to any other recipient of contracts with any other person(s) or group(s), such other recipient, person(s) or group(s) shall also submit such compliance reports to the primary recipient as may be necessary to enable the primary recipient to assure its civil right compliance obligations under any grant award.

M. *Application Procedures.* Applicants are referred to LEAA Guideline Manuals M 7100.1 and M 4500.1, effective editions, for a full discussion of application requirements. All applications must be submitted on Standard Form 424.

In addition to these requirements, applicants must:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the delinquency prevention theories referred to in Paragraph D2 of this announcement and how they relate to problems in the applicant's school district. (20 points)

2. Indicate how the forms and strategies to be tested address problems in the applicant's school district. (10 points)

3. Demonstrate that the historical developments and present political and organizational circumstances in the applicant organizations make the organizational change and/or direct service forms described in this announcement feasible and that it is feasible to implement elements of the type described in Section G. (15 points)

4. Demonstrate that evaluation of the required rigor will be supported. Description of the applicant's prior evaluation experience should be included. (20 points)

5. Discuss the difference between the research and development approach required for this program, and program development primarily for the purpose of service provision. (10 points)

6. Demonstrate prior experience in implementing programs involving organizational changes in schools and/or direct services to particular populations of youth. Describe evaluations of these programs, if applicable. (15 points)

7. Describe the proposed staff's expertise in prevention programming, organizational change, educational program development and research or program evaluation. (Resumes of key staff should be included.) (10 points)

Applications will be rated on the above criteria and will receive scores based upon the weights which have been assigned to each criterion.

Each application must contain a description of the proposed budget for the first two project years. Applicants must describe the extent to which the major operational costs of the project can be borne locally.

Prospective applicants for this program must deliver one (1) original and two (2) copies of the application to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA, Room 442, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20531, by June 23, 1980. Applications sent by mail will be considered to be received on time if sent by registered mail or certified mail no later than June 17, 1980, as evidenced by the U.S. Postal Service postmark or the original receipt from the U.S. Postal Service.

N. *Selection Process.* All applications will be reviewed by OJJDP staff. If more than 20 applications are received, OJJDP will compose a panel to read the applications and score them on the criteria listed in Paragraph M of this announcement. The applications receiving the highest overall ratings will be selected as finalists. Site visits may be made to each of the finalist organizations for further funding consideration, to clarify information submitted in the application, and to provide the applicant with more detailed information on the hypothesis to be tested and the specific program components to be implemented. Key project staff and school personnel must be available to discuss their application between July 4 and August 8, 1980. Based on the applications and the site visits, four (4) to six (6) applicants will be recommended for funding.

O. *Contacts.* For further information regarding this announcement, contact Kathie Costin, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (202-724-7776).

[FR Doc. 80-12438 Filed 4-22-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

federal register

Wednesday
April 23, 1980

Part V

Department of the Interior

Fish and Wildlife Service

Review of the Status of the Bliss Rapids Snail and the Snake River Physa Snail

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Review of the Status of the Bliss Rapids Snail and the Snake River Physa Snail.

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Review of the status of the Bliss Rapids snail and the Snake River physa snail, both from the Snake River, Idaho.

SUMMARY: The Service will review the status of the Bliss Rapids snail (Family Hydrobiidae) and the Snake River physa snail (*Physa* sp.). Both are found only in the Snake River, Idaho.

This action is being taken in response to a petition from Dr. Peter A. Bowler of Laguna Beach, California which presents evidence that these species may be Endangered or Threatened. Further data on the present status, possible Critical Habitats, and impacts of Critical Habitat designations are required before the Service can propose listing this species in accordance with section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.

DATES: Information regarding the status of these species should be submitted on or before July 22, 1980.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons or organizations are requested to submit comments to Director (OES), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John L. Spinks, Jr., Chief, Office of Endangered Species (703/235–2771).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 7, 1980, Dr. Peter A. Bowler petitioned the Fish and Wildlife Service to list the Bliss Rapids snail (Family Hydrobiidae) and the Snake River physa snail (*Physa* sp.) as Threatened. Dr. Bowler reports that these species are being described by Dr. D. W. Taylor, who intends to publish descriptions and scientific names in the near future.

Section 4(a) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) state:

"General—(1) The Secretary shall by regulation determine whether any species is an Endangered species or a Threatened species because of any of the following factors:

(1) The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range;

(2) Overutilization for commercial, sporting, scientific, or educational purposes;

(3) Disease or predation;

(4) The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanism; or

(5) Other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence."

This authority has been delegated to the Director.

The Service has determined that the Bliss Rapids snail and the Snake River physa snail may be Endangered or Threatened because of factors (1) and (4). These findings are based on information in Dr. Bowler's petition, which is summarized below.

The Bliss Rapids snail is restricted to shallow water riffle habitat in the A. J. Wiley Reach of the Snake River in Gooding and Twin Falls Counties, Idaho. The Snake River physa snail has been found in the same habitat and localities as the Bliss Rapids snail, as well as in the Snake River near Homedale, Owyhee County, Idaho.

The habitat of both species in the A. J. Wiley Reach is threatened by impoundment that would result from the A. J. Wiley Project.

These unique species are remnants of the extensive late Pleistocene freshwater fauna of southern Idaho.

The Service is soliciting any additional information on these species, including data on their taxonomic status, distribution, habitat requirements recommended Critical Habitats, and possible economic and other impacts of designating such areas as Critical Habitat. This information will be evaluated to determine if these species should be proposed for listing as Endangered or Threatened, and whether Critical Habitat should be designated.

This notice of review was prepared by Dr. Steven M. Chambers, Office of Endangered species (703/235–1975).

Dated: April 17, 1980.

Robert S. Cook,

Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 80–12417 Filed 4–22–80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

federal register

Wednesday
April 23, 1980

Part VI

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Human Development Services

Research and Training Centers; Announcement of Availability of Grant Funds

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Human Development Services

[Program Announcment No. 13654-801]

Research and Training Centers; Availability of Grant Funds

AGENCY: National Institute of Handicapped Research, (NIHR) Office of Human Development Services, (OHDS) Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, (DHEW).

ACTION: Announcement of availability of grant funds for rehabilitation research and training center program in the rehabilitation of persons with deafness.

SUMMARY: The National Institute of Handicapped Research (NIHR) announces that applications are being accepted for a grant under Title II of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Pub. L. 94-602 (Rehabilitation, Comprehensive Services and Developmental Disabilities Amendments of 1978) to establish a Rehabilitation Research and Training Center in the area of deafness. Regulations applicable to this program were published in the **Federal Register**, Subpart A and Subpart D of Part 1362, Chapter VIII of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR Part 1362) of November 25, 1975. However, these regulations are currently undergoing revision and will appear as Notice of Proposed Rule-making early in May 1980. These revised regulations will be applicable to all grants and continuation awards funded subsequent to the date of final issuance. Institutions of higher education, states and public and private organizations associated with institutions of higher education may apply.

DATES: Closing date for receipt of application is June 13, 1980. Applicants are encouraged to respond at an earlier date if possible.

Scope of This Announcement

This Program Announcement covers one funding priority of the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center Program for Fiscal Year 1980. This funding priority is in the area of deafness. Deafness means both those individuals who have no hearing for speech reception and those in that borderline population who may hear some spoken words, with or without amplification, but not connected discourse.

Program Purpose

Title II of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Pub. L. 95-602 (Rehabilitation, Comprehensive Services, and Developmental Disabilities Amendments of 1978), authorizes the establishment of Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers for conducting rehabilitation research and training. The Centers, discrete organizational and physical entities, are integrated or affiliated with institutions of higher education having expertise and well-developed resources for conducting multidisciplinary research and training, and are associated with service programs considered essential for carrying out comprehensive programs of patient/client care and rehabilitation. The three major activities—research, training, and services—are expected to be mutually supportive. Specifically, this concept calls for research ideas to derive from service delivery problems; for research results to be applied in service delivery settings; and for research results to be disseminated through training.

Program Goal and Objectives

The major goal of a Rehabilitation Research and Training Center in Deafness is to develop and conduct a well-organized program of rehabilitation research which focuses on the physical, psychological, social, vocational and personal adjustment problems resulting from deafness and to disseminate and promote the utilization of research findings through training. NIHR defines a probram of research as that in which the entire research program is planned so as to contribute in a sequential or complementary way to a centralized body of knowledge of manageable scope. Each separate study or investigation must have some reasonable relationship to the central topic or research core area and must be undertaken on the basis of a predetermined plan developed upon the basis of a review of what is already known about the topic. The research should focus on a limited number of higher priority areas. The research findings should have relevance and application to the rehabilitation process of deaf persons. The Centers' training objectives are to develop materials and to conduct teaching and training programs to disseminate and promote the utilization of research findings thereby reducing the delay between the discovery of new knowledge and its application in practice.

Applicants for a Research and Training Center in Deafness must demonstrate their capabilities for achieving the Research and Training Center program goal and objectives. Applicants should identify and develop a minimum of two research core areas they consider priority areas, ranked in order of importance, to be developed during the first year and within the constraint of available federal funds and list in priority order other research core ares they may wish to undetake in later years. Problem areas that may be addressed but not limited to are:

a. Improved methods for assessing rehabilitation potential and for measuring rehabilitation outcomes of persons disabled by deafness.

b. Education on the prevention of deafness.

c. Integration of rehabilitation methods and technologies that might be applicable to multi-handicapped deaf persons particularly those who are mentally retarded or have other developmental disabilities.

d. Improved methods for the vocational evaluation of deaf persons.

e. Job identification, development, adaptation, modification and placement and follow through techniques for the increased employment of deaf people in education, engineering, computer science, industry, commerce, banking, the arts, and government.

f. Self employment and small business opportunities for persons disabled by deafness.

g. The most effective use of sheltered workshops and home industries programs for those deaf persons who cannot enter the competitive labor market.

h. Rehabilitation, including the acquisition and maintenance of independent living skills of deaf aged persons to enable them to live in their residence or home communities as an alternative to traditional nursing home and other institutional placements—accessing Senior Citizen and other centers and programs.

i. Measurement of residual hearing and maximization of its functional use.

j. Development of improved methods for promoting peer support and improving self image to enhance rehabilitation.

k. Methods of providing rehabilitation and other community support services to persons disabled by deafness who live in rural areas.

l. Innovative methods for identifying and providing training services to preschool age children who are disabled by deafness and appropriate services to their families.

m. Advanced communication procedures, methods and techniques.

n. Speech conservation, auditory training and or retraining.

o. Development of models to enable the deaf to have access to the services of community agencies and to enable community agencies to improve extension of their services to deaf persons.

p. Biases in standard educational, audiological and vocational test and measures and modification of these tests and measures for application to deaf persons.

q. Methods for changing societal attitudes toward deaf persons and the attitudes of deaf persons toward themselves that interfere with or prevent deaf people from assuming their full roles in the mainstream of American society.

r. Demographic and other related studies pertaining to people disabled by deafness.

s. The use of consumer groups in improving the design, funding and administration of service delivery; research and training programs pertaining to deaf people; and in bringing about the removal of attitudinal, communication, transportation, and architectural barriers.

t. Environmental barriers that affect full visual participation.

u. Utilization of advanced Telcommunication and Media methodology and technology in training of people disabled by deafness.

Eligible Applicants

Institutions of higher education and public and private organizations having well-recognized programs of research and affiliated with institutions of higher education may apply for the Center grant, provided the Center program has a separate organizational identity.

Available Funds

An application may be up to a five year duration. Applications proposing multi-year activities must be accompanied by an explanation of the need for the multi-year support; a review of the objective and activities proposed; and budget estimates to obtain the objectives in any proposed subsequent year.

Approximately $300,000 is available for the new Research and Training Center in Deafness. This initial grant substains the Federal share of the budget for the first year of the project. Applications for continuation awards will be reviewed annually on a non-competitive basis and approved only if:

(a) Funds are available to continue the Center.

(b) Satisfactory progress has been made in implementing the approved work plan and in achieving the Center goals and objectives as indicated by site visits, progress reports and other relevant data.

(c) The need continues to exist for the activities conducted by the Center.

Grantee Share of the Project

While no specific percentage of grantee sharing is required, grantees are expected to commit their resources to the support of activities of the Center. The administrative overhead costs (indirect) in the Research and Training Center program is limited to 15 percent of the total allowable direct costs.

The Application Process

—*Availability of Forms:* Application for a Research and Training Center grant must be submitted on standard forms provided for this purpose. Application kits which include the forms and other information may be obtained by writing to: National Institute of Handicapped Research, Room 3418, Mary E. Switzer Building, 330 C Streets, SW., Washington, DC. 20201. Attention: 13654–801—Telephone: 202/245–0870.

—*Application Submission:* One signed original and two copies of the grant application, including all attachments, must be submitted to the address indicated in the application instructions. Additionally, a copy of the application is to be submitted concurrently to the appropriate Regional Office and appropriate State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency for review and comment.

—*A–95 Notification Process:* This grant program is exempt from A–95 State and Area Wide Clearinghouses.

Special Consideration for Funding

To insure an equitable geographic distribution of the Research and Training Centers applications from other than the geographic areas in which an RTC in the same area of study is already located will be given priority. Thus any such application judged acceptable will be funded before other applications.

Application Consideration

The Director of the National Institute of Handicapped Research determines the final action to be taken with respect to each grant application for this program.

All applications are subjected to a competitive review and evaluation conducted by qualified persons including those outside the Federal Government. The results of the competitive review supplement and assist the Director's consideration of the competing applications. The Director's consideration also takes into account comments of the RSA Regional Office, State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies and the NIHR program staff. Comments on the application may also be requested from appropriate specialists and consultants inside and outside the Federal Government.

After the Director has reached a decision either to disapprove or not to fund a grant application, unsuccessful applicants are notified in writing of this decision. The successful applicant is notified through the issuance of a notice of financial assistance awarded which sets forth the amount of funds granted, the terms and conditions of the grant, the budget period for which support is given, the total grantee share expected, and the total period for which project support is contemplated.

Selection Criteria

Grant applications will be reviewed and evaluated against the following criteria:

a. *National Need.* 1. The extent to which the applicant reflects knowledge of and has analyzed rehabilitation needs with specific references to persons or agencies to be served or benefited.

b. *Plan of Operation.* 1. The extent to which the applicant exhibits thorough knowledge of pertinent previous research and relates the proposed research to it.

2. The soundness of the proposed plan of operation including considerations of the extent to which the objectives are clearly described; are capable of being attained; and are measurable.

3. Evidence of a sound administrative structure and organizational mechanism for implementing and operating a center.

4. Evidence of support from rehabilitation agencies, from public and voluntary organizations serving the disabled, and from consumer organizations, and specific measures are described for achieving a high level of interaction between the center and these resources in implementing and operating the center.

5. A description of an Advisory Council used in the development and operation of the center; the types of constituents to be represented; and names and titles of members.

6. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the center research will be effectively utilized and will directly improve affiliated services.

7. The extent to which the research conducted by the center is likely to be effectively utilized in other programs for similar purposes.

8. The extent of provisions made for research dissemination and for making materials, techniques and other outputs available to those concerned with

rehabilitation with which the center itself is concerned.

9. The applicant demonstrates evidence of programmatic research within the research core areas.

10. The methodological soundness of individual research & training project.

11. The extent of the relationship between the research and training projects and the identified research core areas.

12. Evidence that the training projects are in consonance with and capable of achieving training objectives.

c. *Evaluation Plan.* 1. Provisions are made for adequate evaluation of the effectiveness of the center program and for determining the extent to which objectives are accomplished.

d. *Adequacy of Resources.* 1. The university with which the center is affiliated has multidisciplinary rehabilitation resources available that will insure a sound and substantial growth of a significant Research and Training Center.

2. The center demonstrates an affiliation arrangement with the university and the affiliated clinical services, but is a distinct organizational unit and sufficiently independent in its administration within the affiliated arrangement.

3. The degree to which the center can draw upon and coordinate the resources and staff efforts of the university and the clinical component to accomplish its objectives.

4. The adequacy of the facilities and resources available to the center to conduct the proposed work.

e. *Budget and Cost Effectiveness.* 1. The extent to which the budget reflects the activities and the reasonableness of the allocation of the resources among the activities.

2. The costs of the program are reasonable to the government in relation to expected benefits.

3. The extent of outside support and services.

f. *Quality of Key Personnel.* 1. Project personnel, actual or proposed, are highly qualified and appointments of core staff are appropriate.

Closing Date for Receipt of Applications

The closing date for receipt of applications under this Program Announcement is June 13, 1980. Applicants are encouraged to respond at an earlier date if possible. Applications may be mailed or hand delivered. Hand delivered applications will be accepted during regular working hours at 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

An application will be considered to have arrived bay the closing date if:

1. The application was sent by registered or certified mail no later than June 13, 1980 as evidenced by the U.S. Postal Service postmark or the original receipt from the U.S. Postal Service unless the application arrives too late to be considered by the independent review panel.

2. The application is hand delivered to the office designated to receive the application in the application instructions. Hand delivered applications will be accepted no later than close of business, June 13, 1980, in any case.

Late applications are not acceptable and applicants will be notified accordingly.

In view of the limited time remaining in the fiscal year for applicants to prepare and submit their applications and for selection of the grantee, and because of the need to begin operations under the grant as soon as possible, the Director has determined under 5 U.S.C. 533 that public comment on the standards in this notice would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program, Number: 13654, Research and Demonstrations)

Dated: April 9, 1980.

Margaret J. Giannini,

Director of the National Institute of Handicapped Research.

Approved: April 17, 1980.

Cesar A. Perales,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Human Development Services.

[FR Doc. 80-12427 Filed 4-22-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4110-92-M