federal register

Monday
August 1, 1994

Part VIII

Department of Justice

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Delinquency Prevent Program Guideline; Notice

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Delinquency Prevention Program Guideline

AGENCY: Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

ACTION: Notice of final guideline for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Title V Delinquency Prevention Program.

SUMMARY: The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) published a proposed guideline for the Title V Delinquency Prevention Program on February 11, 1994, and solicited public comments. Based on the analysis of those public comments, OJJDP is issuing this final guideline. This Program is of interest to all Federal, State, local, and private organizations involved with prevention planning and services for children, youth and families.

DATES: This final guideline is effective on August 1, 1994.

ADDRESSES: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Room 742, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20531

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul E. Steiner, Social Science Program Specialist, State Relations and Assistance Division, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, at the above address. Telephone (202) 307–5924.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: Section 504(1) of the JJDP Act directs OJJDP to issue "such rules as are appropriate and necessary to carry out" the Title V—Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs.

Changes to Proposed Guideline

The following changes are made to the proposed guideline. New language is italicized.

Throughout the guideline, references to "units of local government" are changed to "units of *general* local government."

The following sentence is added to the last paragraph under "Local Subgrantee Qualifications": *State Advisory Groups may not arbitrarily exclude an eligible unit of general local government from competing for Title V funds.*

Under "Application Requirements for State Agencies," the first sentence is amended as follows: State agencies must provide evidence of the State Advisory Group's authority to approve the award of Title V subgrants *or, where a separate supervisory board is vested with such authority, to review and recommend approval to the board. No Title V subgrants can be made to a unit of general local government absent the approval or recommendation of the State Advisory Group.*

Under "Application Requirements for State Agencies," the following paragraph is inserted after the fifth paragraph of that section: *The application must include a time-task plan providing a description of the major tasks which the State will employ to implement the Title V program, and the timeframes for completing each of those tasks.*

Under "Application Requirements for State Agencies" the fourth paragraph is amended as follows: 2. To monitor and *assure* the audit of subgrants for performance, outcome, and fiscal integrity, including cash and in-kind match, *as specified in the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs Guideline Manual M–7100, "Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants."*

The first sentence under "Process for Subgrant Award and Administration" is amended to read: State agency grantees shall use essentially the same process for making Title V subawards as that used for the Formula Grant awards, with the State Advisory Group *establishing applicant eligibility criteria to target specific types of communities, if needed, and making or recommending* the final decision on funding *individual applications.*

Under "Application Process for Units of general local government," subsection 3. "Local Three-Year Delinquency Prevention Plan," the following sentence is inserted between the second and third sentence of the second paragraph of the subsection: *The applicant should also assure that the PPB, to the extent possible, contains one or more members under the age of twenty-one, one or more parents or guardians with children who have had contact or are at risk of having contact with the juvenile justice system, and an overall membership that generally reflects the racial, ethnic, and cultural composition of the community's youth population.*

Under the section titled "Application Process for Units of General Local Government," subsection 3. "Local Three Year Delinquency Prevention Plan," the eleventh paragraph (paragraph j.) is amended to read: A description of how the PPB will *provide general oversight for developing the plan, approve the plan prior to submission to the State, and* make recommendations to the responsible local agency for the distribution of funds and evaluation of funded activities.

Under the section titled "Duration of Grants and Continuation Funding," the following changes are made: (1) The following sentence is stricken: Grants may be awarded for project periods of 12 to 36 months, with initial awards of up to one year. The following two sentences replace the stricken sentence: *OJJDP will award grants to States for a project period beginning on the date of award and ending on September 30, 1996. States will award grants to units of general local government in annual increments covering not more than 12 months each, with overall project periods of 12 to 36 months;* and (2) in the second sentence the word "continuation" is stricken and replaced with *Subsequent years'.* At the end of that sentence, "subsequent fiscal years" is stricken.

Background

A new program was authorized in the 1992 amendments to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, (hereafter "the Act" or "the JJDP Act") in Title V, Sections 501–506, "Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act." For Fiscal Year 1994, Congress appropriated $13 million for initial implementation of Title V.

Prevention has been one of the primary goals of the Act since its enactment in 1974. The premise is that preventing delinquent behavior is a much more cost-effective means of reducing juvenile crime than attempting to rehabilitate adjudicated delinquents. Prevention is also a much more cost-effective way to deal with juvenile delinquency. In addition to reducing the human and financial losses caused by crime, effective delinquency prevention also reduces the need for costly juvenile justice system processing and adjudication. Each year, juvenile courts handle approximately 1.4 million delinquency and status offense cases, resulting in nearly 130,000 out-of-home placements. On any given day, approximately 90,000 juveniles are held in juvenile detention, correctional and shelter facilities. Nationally, nearly $2 billion a year is spent operating these facilities. The average annual cost of confining a juvenile in a training school exceeds $45,000 in many States. The cost for intensive, private residential treatment for a serious juvenile offender can run as high as $100,000 per year. The cost for construction of secure facilities for juveniles is currently about $100,000 per bed.

In order to be eligible to fully participate in the Formula Grants Program of the JJDP Act, States must develop and adhere to policies, practices, and laws which deinstitutionalize status offenders and nonoffenders, separate adults and juveniles held in secure institutions, and eliminate the practice of detaining or confining juveniles in adult jails and lockups. In addition, States must address efforts to reduce the disproportionate representation of minority juveniles in secure facilities, where such condition exists. These four goals (deinstitutionalization of status offenders, separation, jail removal, and disproportionate minority confinement) are commonly called the Formula Grants Program "mandates," and are a major focus of States' Federally funded efforts under the Act. In order to meet statutory requirements for compliance, approximately 70% of the States at one time or another have devoted 100% of all available formula grant funds toward meeting the mandates. Thus, many States have been limited in the amount of JJDP Act funds that could be devoted to prevention.

Title V of the JJDP Act is designed to provide a dedicated fund source for States to award grants for delinquency prevention and early intervention programs for local communities, provided that the applicant unit of general local government, or combination thereof, is in compliance with the JJDP Act mandates.

Congress has structured the Title V Delinquency Prevention Program to support such units that have formulated a community-wide strategy to address the prevention of delinquency. A community will be required to have a prevention strategy based on assessment of risk factors associated with the development of delinquent behavior in the community's children.

Title V authorizes the Administrator of OJJDP to make grants to a State, to be transmitted through the State Advisory Group, to units of general local government for delinquency prevention programming. The State agency which administers the JJDP Act Formula Grant in each State will be eligible to apply for funding and receive an amount determined by a formula based on the State's population of youth under the maximum age of original juvenile court delinquency jurisdiction, with a minimum allocation of $75,000 per State and $25,000 per Territory.

States will invite units of general local government that meet the statutorily mandated eligibility requirements, and as further limited by the State Advisory Group, to apply for funding. In order to be eligible, local applicants must: (1) Be certified by the State Advisory Group to be in compliance with the JJDP Act Formula Grants mandates; (2) designate or convene a local Prevention Policy Board; and (3) develop a local, comprehensive delinquency prevention plan.

Approach

Many past delinquency prevention planning and programming efforts, while well intentioned, have been unsuccessful because of their negative focus on attempting to prevent juveniles from misbehaving. Another weakness of past delinquency prevention efforts is their narrow scope, generally focussing on only one or two aspects of a child's life such as individual behaviors or family problems. Successful delinquency prevention strategies must be positive in their orientation and comprehensive in their scope.

Positive approaches that emphasize opportunities for healthy social, physical and mental development and take into account individual, family, peer group, school, and community influences on a child's development have been shown to have a much greater likelihood of success.

Risk-focused delinquency prevention is a comprehensive approach based on the premise that in order to prevent a problem from occurring, the factors that contribute to the development of that problem must be identified and addressed.

Research conducted over the past half century has clearly documented five categories of risk factors for juvenile delinquency: (1) Individual characteristics such as alienation, rebelliousness and lack of bonding to society; (2) family influences such as parental conflict, child abuse, poor family management practices, and family history of problem behavior (substance abuse, criminality, teen pregnancy, and school dropouts); (3) school experiences such as early academic failure and lack of commitment to school; (4) peer group influences such as friends who engage in problem behavior (minor criminality, drugs, gangs and violence); and (5) neighborhood and community factors such as economic deprivation, high rates of substance abuse and crime, and neighborhood disorganization.

To counter these risk factors, protective factors must be introduced. Protective factors are qualities or conditions that moderate a juvenile's exposure to risk. Research indicates that protective factors fall into three basic categories: (1) Individual characteristics such as a resilient temperament and a positive social orientation; (2) bonding with pro-social family members, teachers, adults, and friends; and (3) healthy beliefs and clear standards for behavior. While individual characteristics are difficult to change, bonding and clear standards for behavior work together and can be changed. To increase bonding, children must be provided with: (1) Opportunities to contribute to their family, school, peer group and community; (2) skills to take advantage of opportunities; and (3) recognition for efforts to contribute.

At the same time, parents, teachers and communities need to set clear standards regarding pro-social behavior.

A risk-focused delinquency prevention approach calls on communities to identify the risk factors to which their children are exposed. Risked-focused delinquency prevention provides communities with a conceptual framework for prioritizing the risk factors in their community, assessing how their current resources are being used, identifying resources which are needed, and choosing specific programs and strategies that directly address those risk factors through the enhancement of protective factors.

This approach requires a commitment by and participation of the entire community in developing and implementing a comprehensive strategy. While the roles of governmental agencies in this strategy will vary, it is essential that the citizens of the community create a diverse and representative coalition in which public officials and agencies are equal members with private citizens and agencies. It is this coalition which leads the community's prevention strategy in addressing the needs of children and their families at risk.

Another key component of this approach is the coordination and use of existing programs and resources. A community-wide prevention strategy must inventory available State, local, private, and Federal resources, and develop vehicles for making these resources and programs readily accessible to children and families in need. Thus, applicants for Title V funds are encouraged to coordinate this prevention effort with other Federally funded efforts.

Target Population

The Title V Delinquency Prevention Program is based on a program design which addresses those risk factors which are known to be associated with delinquent behavior. The program seeks to address these factors at the earliest appropriate stage in each child's

development. The target population is all at-risk children in a given community. Funds awarded under this program will be used to address delinquency risk-factors in communities, and as such may be used to fund ameliorative services for at-risk children.

Funding Structure

Title V, Section 505 of the Act, authorizes the Administrator of OJJDP to make grants to a State, to be transmitted through the State Advisory Group, to units of general local government.

Technical Assistance

Because the Title V Delinquency Prevention Program is based on a risk-focused program structure, OJJDP will make training and technical assistance on risk-focused prevention available to representatives of units of general local government through the State agency administering the program.

Program Goal

The goal of this program is to reduce delinquency and youth violence by supporting communities in providing their children, families, neighborhoods, and institutions with the knowledge, skills, and opportunities necessary to foster a healthy and nurturing environment which supports the growth and development of productive and responsible citizens.

Program Objectives

The objectives of the program are:

1. To form coalitions within communities to mobilize the community and direct delinquency prevention efforts;
2. To identify those known delinquency risk factors which are present in communities;
3. To identify protective factors which will counteract identified risk factors, and develop local comprehensive, delinquency prevention plans to strengthen these protective factors;
4. To develop local comprehensive, delinquency prevention strategies which use and coordinate Federal, State, local and private resources for establishing a client-centered continuum of services for at-risk children and their families;
5. To implement the delinquency prevention strategies, monitor their progress, and modify the plans as needed.

Basic Program Design

The program will be implemented in two phases: the pre-award planning phase and the implementation phase. Applicant units of general local government may modify or enhance existing prevention planning boards, plans and strategies to meet the requirements for Title V funding.

Planning Phase

The planning phase for each local applicant will occur prior to the award of funds and consist of the designation or formation of a local policy board to direct the project, and the development of a three-year delinquency prevention plan. OJJDP is making training and technical assistance available through the State agency to interested potential local applicants during this phase. Eligible State agencies may apply for and receive Title V awards from OJJDP based on this final Title V Guideline.

Implementation Phase

The implementation phase will begin with the award of subgrants to units of general local government. Technical assistance will continue to be available to grantees.

Funding Structure and Grantee Qualifications

Title V authorizes the Administrator of OJJDP to make grants to States to be transmitted through the State Advisory Groups to qualified units of general local government or combinations thereof. The State Advisory Group is the board appointed by the chief executive officer of the State, as provided by Section 223(a)(3) of the Act (Section 503). A unit of general local government means any city, county, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State, and any Indian tribe which performs law enforcement functions as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. . . (Section 103(8)).

OJJDP will award grants to States based on a formula determined by each State's relative population of youth below the maximum age limit for original juvenile court delinquency jurisdiction. The States will subgrant the funds to qualified units of general local government based on a competitive process. Jurisdictions that do not have discrete units of general local government may award funds directly to governmental agencies or private nonprofit organizations to implement projects in furtherance of the jurisdiction's own comprehensive prevention strategy.

All Title V funds must be matched by recipient units of general local government or by the State with 50% of the amount of the grant. This match may be provided in cash or the value of in-kind contributions or services. States are encouraged to supplement Title V funds with Formula Grant funds. However, Formula Grant funds cannot be used as match for Title V funds.

State Grantee Qualifications

Each State, as defined in Section 103(7) of the Act, is eligible to apply for Title V funds, provided that it has a State agency designated by the chief executive under Section 299(c) of the Act, and a State Advisory Group appointed pursuant to Section 223(a)(3) of the Act. The applicant State agency must provide an assurance that the State Advisory Group has or will have the sole authority, consistent with State law or policy, to approve or recommend approval of Title V subgrants to units of general local government, pursuant to the provisions of this program guideline.

Local Subgrantee Qualifications

In order for a unit of general local government to be eligible to apply for Title V funds, such unit, or each unit applying in combination, must be certified by the State Advisory Group as in compliance with Sections 223(a)(12)(A), 223(a)(13), 223(a)(14), and 233(a)(23) of the JJDP Act. If a State is not currently in full compliance with any of the first three of these mandates, i.e. the quantifiable mandates, or is in full compliance with *de minimis* exceptions, only those units of general local government which are within the de minimis parameters provided in 28 CFR 31.303(f)(6)(i) and (f)(6)(iii)(A), based on the locality's most current census data, may be deemed in compliance with the mandates of Sections 223(a)(12)(A), (13), and (14).

In order to be in compliance with Section 223(a)(23), the State Advisory Group must certify that the unit of general local government is cooperating in data gathering and analysis to determine if disproportionate minority confinement exists, or if it is known to exist within the boundaries or jurisdiction of the unit of general local government, the unit has made or is making an adequate effort toward addressing, or assisting the State to address, this issue.

The State Advisory Group will competitively award, or recommend for award, Title V grants to units of general local government based on how well competing units meet the competitive criteria set forth below under *Priority Consideration for Funding*. State Advisory Groups may not arbitrarily exclude an eligible unit of general local government from competing for Title V funds.

Application Process—Eligible State Agencies

All State agencies designated by the chief executive under Section 299(c) of the Act are eligible to apply for Title V funds. A list of these agencies and the allocations of funds to the State for a particular fiscal year may be obtained from OJJDP.

Application Requirements for State Agencies

State agencies must provide evidence of the State Advisory Group's authority to approve the award of Title V subgrants or, where a separate supervisory board is vested with such authority, to review and recommend approval to the board. No Title V subgrants can be made to a unit of general local government absent the approval or recommendation of the State Advisory Group. Examples of such authority would be an executive order, a statute, a formal resolution of the State Advisory Group, a formal resolution of the supervisory board which the State Advisory Group advises, or a written agreement between the State agency and the State Advisory Group.

The application must also include an assurance that the State Advisory Group and the State agency will establish written subgrantee eligibility criteria, described above under *Local Subgrantee Qualifications*, and competitive criteria based on the criteria described below under *Priority Consideration for Funding*. The State may issue additional criteria, including criteria designed to focus delinquency prevention efforts toward those areas of the State displaying the greatest need of comprehensive delinquency prevention planning and programs.

Furthermore, the application must provide the following administrative assurances:

1. To report on all subgrant awards, within thirty days of award, on the OJJDP form, "Individual Project Report, Part I: Initial Report of Funding";

2. To monitor and assure the audit of subgrants for performance, outcome and fiscal integrity, including cash and in-kind match, as specified in the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs Guideline Manual M–7100, "Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants";

3. To collect quarterly progress and data reports, and forward semi-annual summary reports to OJJDP.

The application must include a time-task plan providing a description of the major tasks which the State will employ to implement the Title V program, and the timeframes for completing each of those tasks.

All awards will be conditioned with additional requirements which are standard for recipients of Federal grants.

State agencies which demonstrate a need to do so in their applications to OJJDP, may use up to 5% of the State's Title V allocation for the costs of administering the Title V subgrants and support for State Advisory Group activities related to Title V. A budget narrative must explain how the administrative funds will be spent, including provision of the required match by the State.

State Application Deadline

State applications are due to OJJDP not later than 60 days after the effective date of this guideline.

Technical Assistance Role of State Agency and State Advisory Group: In their capacities as the primary planning vehicles for juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs within the State, the State agency and the State Advisory Group are encouraged to assume a role as a technical assistance resource for local subgrantees, as well as serving as a resource and information clearinghouse for all prevention activities in the State. The data and strategies developed on the local level should be incorporated in the State Advisory Group's and State agency's statewide, comprehensive planning efforts, as required by Section 223 of the Act. To this end, State agencies and State Advisory Groups are strongly encouraged to participate in risk-focused prevention training and technical assistance made available by OJJDP.

Process for Subgrant Award and Administration

State agency grantees shall use essentially the same process for making Title V subawards as that used for Formula Grant awards, with the State Advisory Group establishing applicant eligibility criteria to target specific types of communities, if needed, and making or recommending the final decision on funding of individual applications. This includes the Request for Proposals, competitive review of applications, and award of subgrants. Likewise, State agencies will monitor Title V subgrants in a similar manner as the Formula Grant subgrants, including the collection and reporting of data required by this program guideline.

In considering applications for awards, State Advisory Groups should be sensitive to the unique needs of rural areas and Native American tribes, including provision of special consideration in the competitive process.

All subgrants should be awarded within 180 days after receipt of the award from OJJDP.

Application Process for Units of General Local Government

1. Pre-application Certification of JJDP Act Compliance

Units of general local government must obtain a certification of compliance from the State Advisory Group prior to applying for an award of funds.

2. Delinquency Prevention Training

OJJDP is making training in risk-focused prevention available to 45 sites across the nation during fiscal year 1994. The only cost associated with this training for participants will be transportation and lodging, if necessary. Facilities for the training will be provided by the States or localities. Training is designed to assist communities in preparing the three year plans required for Title V funding. The initial training will consist of a one day introduction to the theories and strategies of risk-focused prevention planning. Units of general local government considering applying for Title V funding are strongly urged to take advantage of this training opportunity and send key community leaders to the initial training. A subsequent three day workshop will be held for planning teams from local Prevention Policy Boards to complete a risk and resource assessment. OJJDP has advised the State agencies on the process for units of general local government to participate in this training.

3. Local Three-Year Delinquency Prevention Plan

Each unit of general local government's application to the State agency must include a three-year plan describing the extent of risk factors identified in the community and how these risk factors will be addressed. A written explanation of the risk factors and protective factors can be obtained from the State agency grantee. The plan must, at a minimum, contain the following elements:

a. The designation or formation of a local Prevention Policy Board (PPB) consisting of no fewer than 15 and no more than 21 members from the community, representing a balance of public agencies, private nonprofit organizations serving children, youth, and families, and business and industry. Such agencies and organizations may include education, health and mental health, juvenile justice, child welfare,

employment, parent, family, and youth associations, law enforcement, religion, recreation, child protective services, public defenders, prosecutors, and private manufacturing and service sectors. The applicant should also assure that the PPB, to the extent possible, contains one or more members under the age of twenty-one, one or more parents or guardians with children who have had contact or are at risk of having contact with the juvenile justice system, and an overall membership that generally reflects the racial, ethnic, and cultural composition of the community's youth population. A specific local agency or entity must have responsibility for support of the PPB;

b. Evidence of commitment of key community leaders to supporting a comprehensive, delinquency prevention effort. Key leaders may include public and private individuals in key leadership and policy positions who are instrumental in effecting policy changes, controlling resources, and mobilizing the community;

c. Definition of the boundaries of the program's neighborhood or community;

d. An assessment of the readiness of the community or neighborhood to adopt a comprehensive delinquency prevention strategy;

e. An assessment of the prevalence of specific, identified delinquency risk factors in the community, including the establishment of baseline data for the risk factors. The assessment of risk factors must result in a list of priority risk factors to be addressed, as determined and approved by the PPB;

f. Identification of available resources and promising approaches, including Federal, State, local, and private, and a description of how they address identified risk factors, and an assessment of gaps in needed resources and a description of how to address them;

g. A strategy, including goals, objectives, and a timetable, for mobilizing the community to assume responsibility for delinquency prevention. This should include ways of involving the private nonprofit and business sectors in delinquency prevention activities;

h. A strategy, including goals, objectives, and a timetable, for obtaining and coordinating identified resources which will implement the promising approaches that address the priority risk factors. This strategy must include a plan for the coordination of services for at-risk youth and their families;

i. A description of how awarded funds and matching resources will be used to accomplish stated goals and objectives by purchasing of services and goods and leveraging other resources. This should include a budget which lists planned expenditures;

j. A description of how the PPB will provide general oversight for developing the plan, approve the plan prior to submission to the State, and make recommendations to the responsible local agency for the distribution of funds and evaluation of funded activities;

k. A plan for collecting data for the measurement of performance and outcome of project activities.

Priority Consideration for Funding

Only local government applicants certified by the State Advisory Group as in compliance with the mandates of the Act, that have convened a PPB, and have submitted a three year plan will be eligible for funding. In considering applications for funding, State Advisory Groups will give priority to eligible applicants which:

a. Provide a thorough assessment of risk factors and resources, including the quantified measurement of the risk factors which will serve as the baseline for determining project performance and outcome;

b. Identify key community leaders and members of the PPB, describe their roles in the comprehensive delinquency prevention strategy, and provide evidence of key community leaders support;

c. Clearly define the boundaries of the program's neighborhood or community;

d. Provide a realistic assessment, including evidence, of the readiness of the community or neighborhood to adopt a comprehensive delinquency prevention strategy;

e. Provide a coherent plan, including realistic goals and objectives, to mobilize the community and implement a strategy that will address priority risk factors, including innovative ways of involving the private nonprofit and business sectors in delinquency prevention activities;

f. Provide specific strategies for service and agency coordination, including collocation of services at sites readily accessible to children and families in need;

g. Provide a strategy for or evidence of collaborating with other units of local of government and State agencies to develop or enhance a statewide subsidy program to local governments that is dedicated to early intervention and delinquency prevention;

h. Provide a budget outlining the planned expenditures of grant funds and matching resources, including a budget narrative justifying these expenditures;

i. Provide a sound plan for collecting data for measuring performance and outcome;

j. Provide written statements of commitment from State or local public agencies to match in cash or kind, at least 50% of the funds awarded.

Local Application Deadline

The State Advisory Group will determine the application deadline. However, all local subgrant awards should be made within 180 days after the date that the State agency was awarded Title V funds.

Local Grant Administrative Requirements

After receipt of the award, local grantees will provide all required reports and data to the State agency, describing implementation of the program. Technical assistance for program implementation will be available upon request through the State agency.

Evaluation

OJJDP will collect and analyze data collected by each grantee for the purpose of developing national summary reports on the performance and outcome of the local prevention efforts. This evaluation will examine performance in meeting stated objectives as well as the outcome of the project's activities. In order for this evaluation to be meaningful, it is essential that, to the greatest extent possible, the local three year comprehensive delinquency prevention plans contain quantified objectives and baseline measurements of the identified risk factors.

Allocation of Title V Funds to States

The Title V Delinquency Prevention Program has a F.Y. 1994 appropriation of $13 million available for awards to States to support programs of units of general local government. Allocations are available to States based on the number of juveniles in the State who are subject to original juvenile court delinquency jurisdiction based on State law, with a minimum allocation of $75,000 for States and the District of Columbia and $25,000 for Territories and Possessions. A list of the allocations for States is available from OJJDP. The allocations for States not participating in this program in F.Y. 1994, or subsequent years, will be withheld for use in F.Y. 1995, or subsequent years, pursuant to the Title V Delinquency Prevention Program guidelines issued for that year.

Size of Awards to Units of General Local Government

The size of the award to each unit of general local government, or combination thereof, and the total number of awards will be determined by the State Advisory Group, based upon the amount of funds allocated to the State and the quality of the local three-year prevention plans.

Duration of Grants and Continuation Funding

OJJDP will award grants to States for a project period beginning on the date of award and ending on September 30, 1996. States will award grants to units of general local government in annual increments covering not more than 12 months each, with overall project periods of 12 to 36 months. Subsequent years' funding will be contingent upon satisfactory performance and the availability of funds. Future funding is dependent upon Congressional action.

Restrictions on Uses of Funds: Title V funds cannot be used for construction, land acquisition, or supplantation of Federal, State, or local funds supporting existing programs or activities.

Responses to Public Comments

Twenty-seven comments to the proposed guideline were received. A summary of the comments and OJJDP's responses follow. In many instances, the summary comments listed below incorporate specific comments from more than one respondent.

Comment. The guideline appears to focus on risk factors and reducing delinquency without providing adequate emphasis to protective factors and positive youth outcomes. A prevention approach which is protection focused or risk and protection focused seems more in line with OJJDP's strategy.

Response. The structure of the Title V program is based on identifying risk factors that can lead to the development of delinquency and violence in children and youth, and developing strategies to eliminate or ameliorate the risk factors. A key component of this strategy is to provide the protective factors which serve to buffer children and youth from the damaging effects of risk factors.

To better express this strategy, the Title V program will be referred to as a risk and protection focused strategy.

Comment. The guideline should refer to children and youth, and emphasis should go to youth eleven years and older, since this population most often lacks positive alternatives in their communities.

What age is the program targeting? Would programs for parenting skills and early infant bonding be appropriate? The program needs to place more emphasis on parental responsibility and skills training.

Response. The guideline states that "the program seeks to address these (risk) factors at the earliest appropriate stage in each child's development." The Title V program is structured to accommodate what each individual community has identified as the best strategy to reduce risk factors and increase protective factors. For some communities this may require emphasizing the ages of zero to three, for others it may mean eleven years and older, and in others it may require a focus on adolescents.

Comment. The clear thrust of the proposed guideline is toward primary prevention. Given the increasing emphasis on primary and secondary prevention in funding proposals now before Congress, OJJDP should make clear in the final guideline that in communities where the greatest need is for tertiary program, those communities are also encouraged to apply for these funds.

Response. OJJDP formulated the Title V program based on a risk and protection focused strategy. This decision was based on OJJDP's research and demonstration program experience, as well as the provisions of Title V. While the risk and protection focused strategy stresses secondary prevention, the comprehensive planning process employed by communities may also yield tertiary and primary prevention programs.

The three levels of prevention (primary, secondary, and tertiary) usually overlap to some degree, especially in a risk and protection focused strategy such as that employed in the Title V program. The risk and protection focus of the strategy analyzes and addresses the root causes of problem behavior and violence which can affect all children (primary prevention), including those who have been identified as at-risk (secondary prevention), and those who have committed offenses and have been referred to the juvenile justice system (tertiary prevention).

Section 505(a) under Title V states that grants may be used for "delinquency prevention programs and activities for youth who have had or are likely to have contact with the juvenile justice system, including the provision to children, youth and families of: (1) Recreation services; (2) tutoring and remedial education; (3) assistance in the development of work skills; (4) child and adolescent health and mental health services; (5) alcohol and substance abuse prevention services; (6) leadership development activities; and (7) the teaching that people are and should be held accountable for their actions." Information and technical assistance on these and other prevention programs and strategies are available from OJJDP.

Comment. Gender-specific services should be part of every community's comprehensive strategy.

Response. Through the risk and resource assessment, each community will have an opportunity to analyze service gaps and address those gaps with programs and strategies which have had positive or promising results. OJJDP is making technical assistance and training available to States and localities who would like to enhance their assessment skills in analyzing service gaps.

Comment. The guideline should list attention deficit disorder and lack of support for parents with children with disabilities as risk factors.

Response. The risk factors cited in the training that OJJDP is providing for potential Title V applicants includes three school related factors: Early and Persistent Antisocial Behavior, Academic Failure in Elementary School, and Lack of Commitment to School. Learning disabilities can be related to each of these risk factors.

Comment. A sixth program objective should be added which focuses on methodology. This would provide a basis for improving professional practice within and among the organizations working with youth.

Response. Although the guideline does not require a specific methodology for planning or programming, it does provide general guidance on methodology along the lines of a risk and protection focused strategy. The training and technical assistance that is available through OJJDP provides a means of improving professional practice.

Comment. Will private non-profit agencies have difficulty in being subgranted funds if a local unit of government does not wish to apply but does wish to participate?

Response. Section 505(a) under Title V of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP Act) authorizes the Administrator to "make grants to a State, to be transmitted through the State Advisory Group, to units of general local government * * *" The only means by which private non-profit organizations can receive Title V funds would be through service contracts with units of general local government.

Comment. Are school districts eligible to apply for Title V funds?

Response. Section 503 of the JJDP Act provides for only units of general local government to be the applicants for Title V funds. A school district is not a unit of general local government.

The proposed guideline did not consistently use the term "unit of general local government." The final guideline is amended to use this term consistently.

Comment. The guideline appears to grant sole authority to award grants to the State Advisory Group. How will the awards be made if State statute does not grant the State Advisory Group such authority? If the Governor signs the grant, must the State Advisory Group approve the award?

Response. The guideline, under "State Grantee Qualifications," has been revised to require the State agency applicant to provide an assurance that the State Advisory Group has the sole authority, consistent with State law or policy, to approve or recommend the award of Title V subgrants.

Comment. Can private not-for-profit organizations participate in public-private partnerships with operational prevention coalitions?

Response. Under the Title V program, a unit of general local government could vest a public-private organization with significant responsibility for implementation of the program. However, the local government would still be responsible to the State for administering any Title V funds.

Comment. Municipalities with populations in excess of 3 million should be eligible to receive grants directly from OJJDP.

Response. Section 505 of the JJDP Act authorizes the Administrator to "make grants to a State, to be transmitted through the State Advisory Group to units of general local government."

Comment. The formula for allocating funds to States should be amended to include all youth up to 18 years of age, regardless of the maximum age of original juvenile court delinquency jurisdiction.

Response. Because a community can only prevent delinquency in a juvenile who is subject to a juvenile court's delinquency jurisdiction, the most logical and appropriate means for allocating Title V funds is to use a formula determined by each State's relative population of youth below the age limit for original juvenile court delinquency jurisdiction.

Comment. Regional plans for Title V should be permitted.

Response. The guideline allows for combinations of units of general local government to apply for Title V funds. However, the regional plan which is the product by such a regional collaboration must define the boundaries of the target neighborhoods or communities.

Comment. States will be implementing the Title V program using varying timetables and strategies. OJJDP should require the States' applications to include a time-task plan.

Response. This requirement has been added Under "Application Requirements for State Agencies," in the guideline.

Comment. Four respondents indicated that the match requirement was too onerous for small communities and private nonprofit organizations. The respondents recommended that a reduced level of match be allowed.

Response. Title V requires that "the unit or State has agreed to provide a 50% match of the amount of the grant, including the value of in-kind contributions, to fund the activity." (Section 505(b)(7)).

This provision provides some flexibility in the match requirement. First, the match, which is 50 cents on the dollar, has to be made for every dollar granted to the local level. However, the State can provide a portion of the funding through State program dollars. Second, the match can be made in cash or in-kind. In-kind match is discussed in a separate response.

It should be noted that the Title V provision does not require a match from any agency other than the State or the unit of general local government. It is the responsibility of the unit of general local government to provide the match, not nonprofit service providers.

Comment. Two respondents recommended that in certain instances, the match requirement should exclude in-kind match and require a cash match only.

Response. Congress intended the in-kind match provision to allow flexibility in providing local resources. Although the in-kind match provision may require more diligence on the part of the State in assuring that the match requirement is met, the State cannot restrict the match to cash because this is a benefit provided to local recipients by statute.

Comment. The guideline should require that local applications provide formal interagency agreements which promote "contractual" agreements vs. "intentional" agreements.

Response. The guideline allows for statements of commitment in order to give the State flexibility in determining what form those statements of commitment should take. Given the timeframes for the planning process in the guideline, it may not be possible for a locality to obtain formal interagency agreements prior to submission of the plan.

Comment. Can the State Advisory Group limit the availability of funds to a specific local government or a specific set of risk factors?

Response. The State Advisory Group and State agency may issue funding guidelines which focus available funds on areas with the greatest need. If a State chooses this approach, the award of funds is to still be determined through a competitive process that solicits proposals from areas which meet criteria established by the State Advisory Group. It is possible that these criteria may result in a limited number of units of general local government being eligible to apply.

In targeting communities with particular needs for purposes of soliciting proposals, the State Advisory Group may include specific risk factors in the targeting criteria. However, applicants must still analyze the incidence of all risk factors in their local comprehensive plans.

The State Advisory Group and the State agency may not limit the competition based solely on criteria which are not related to juvenile crime or other indications of need. For example, the State Advisory Group may not limit competition to particular communities based solely on population size. To do so would result in the arbitrary exclusion of communities from competition in the Title V program. The guideline is revised under "Local Subgrantee Qualifications" to reflect this requirement.

Comment. The timeframes allowed in the guideline for the development of local comprehensive plans are too restrictive, especially if a locality does not have any available planning resources. What happens if a local applicant cannot meet the 180 day deadline? OJJDP should allow States to award the first and second year of Title V funds through one RFP process after the new Federal fiscal year.

Response. The guideline states that "all subgrant awards should be made within 180 days after receipt of the award from OJJDP." OJJDP intends this 180 day timeframe to serve as a target date, particularly in States where localities are developing their Title V prevention plans on a base previously established through other risk-focused prevention planning efforts. OJJDP recognizes that some States and localities are new to prevention planning, and more time will be required to develop comprehensive three year plans. OJJDP is providing

technical assistance and training to States and localities to enhance their ability to implement the Title V program in the most expeditious manner possible without sacrificing quality.

Comment. The guideline suggests that Title V funds should be used in conjunction with the JJDP Act Formula Grant funds. The time frame for these two planning cycles do not coincide.

Response. Title V requires three year local plans and the Formula Grant requires three year State plans. OJJDP encourages the State Advisory Groups and State agencies to develop a mechanism whereby the local plans can be integrated in the State plan.

The proposed guideline, under "Duration of Grants and Continuation Funding" has been revised to more accurately describe the grant award process by providing that "OJJDP will award grants to States for a project period beginning on the date of award and ending on September 30, 1996. States will award grants to units of general local government in annual increments covering not more than 12 months each, with overall project periods of 12 to 36 months."

Comment. Will Title V funds be available in to States in future years?

Response. OJJDP will make future years' Title V funds available to States and localities through the process described in the guideline, pending satisfactory performance and availability of funds. OJJDP will determine satisfactory performance of State grantees and the States will determine satisfactory performance of local grantees.

Comment. The Title V program should be coordinated with other similar Federal programs, such as the Family Preservation Act.

The guideline should require local applicants to document collaboration with other Federal programs.

Response. OJJDP strongly encourages coordination with other Federal, State and local programs. OJJDP is working with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to establish mechanisms to facilitate coordination with the Family Preservation and Support Services provision and other programs which use a community coalition planning approach to prevention. In addition, OJJDP will provide technical assistance and training to States and localities on accessing and collaborating with other Federal programs.

The guideline indicates that a "key component of the prevention approach is the coordination and use of existing resources." The guideline encourages applicants to coordinate this effort with other Federally funded programs.

Comment. Who signs the local application? The highest elected local official?

Response. The local application may be signed by any official authorized to do so by the applicant unit of general local government.

Comment. Can a county, and municipalities within a county, both be eligible to apply?

Response. Yes, provided that funding is contingent upon coordination of the respective plans.

Comment. Can Title II, Part B Formula Grant funds be used to help localities develop local plans?

Response. Yes. The use of Formula Grant program funds for the development of local delinquency prevention plans is a permissible expenditure of these funds.

Comment. What if a local plan is missing one of the required elements?

Response. The local plan must contain all the required elements listed in the guideline before the locality can receive Title V funds.

Comment. It is not clear whether the funds can be used for service delivery or planning.

Response. Title V funds are used for service delivery.

Comment. The guideline refers to the "Communities that Care" model of risk-focused prevention. Can grant recipients employ other risk-focused prevention models?

Response. Yes. Localities may base their three year plan and strategy on other delinquency prevention models, provided that they are based on a risk and protection focused model that uses: (1) The analysis of risk factors which are grounded in sound theory and positive research results, and (2) protective factors which have a sound theoretical basis and positive or promising research results.

OJJDP is offering training and TA on risk and protection focused prevention which permits States and localities to use any risk and protection focused model.

Comment. We interpret the Title V audit requirements to be different than that of an A–128 audit.

Response. The provisions of OMB Circulars A–128 and A–133 apply to Title V funds.

Comment. The guideline indicates project periods for local grants of 12 to 36 months. It may be beneficial to allow for up to a 60 month project period to facilitate the measurement of outcomes of the projects.

Response. Title V is designed as a long term program. Based on the experience of communities that are implementing prevention programs of similar design, we anticipate that three to five years is not an unreasonable time to expect a community coalition, such as the Title V Prevention Policy Board, to establish itself as a viable organization with the influence necessary to help effect system change.

In the proposed guideline, OJJDP has provided a 12–36 month timeframe to provide flexibility for accommodating a wide range of community planning and coalition building experience by local Title V grant recipients. Some communities may only need a one year period to augment on-going risk focused prevention activities. For other communities, this may be their first attempt at this type of comprehensive prevention planning and programs. In addition, this timeframe will facilitate integrating the planning for Title V with that of the Formula Grants program.

In general, the use of Title V funds is intended to provide an incentive to plan and implement delinquency prevention programs at the local level. States may wish to provide competitive Title II funding for local prevention programs following Title V funding, and local grantees can seek funds for expansion from a range of State, Federal, and foundation sources.

The guideline requires the collection of performance and outcome data. OJJDP encourages States and local grantees to continue collecting this data for their prevention programs to measure outcomes beyond the period of Title V funding. OJJDP is also planning to continue collecting and analyzing data for selected jurisdictions through an on-going national evaluation of Title V.

Comment. Funding formulas have favored urban over suburban communities. The opportunity for equal programming throughout the State would be most desirable or at least a funding formula created that allows suburban communities to compete with like communities.

Response. Under the guideline, States have the discretion to target those communities in the State with the greatest need. The judgment the State Advisory Group can best determine whether to limit the competition for the grants to specific, targeted communities or to conduct a statewide competition. Given the limited amount of Title V funds available to each State and the local competition requirements, distribution of funds based on a population formula would not be feasible. The State Advisory Group and State agency could, however, conduct competitions among applicants of

specific types of geographic areas (urban, suburban, rural).

Comment. The guidelines should specifically prohibit or discourage the withdrawal of community funds from agencies to provide the match for Title V programs, especially in cases where collaborative efforts between agencies and government would serve the same purpose and clients.

Response. The guideline prohibits using Title V funds to supplant Federal, State, or local funds supporting existing programs. The guideline encourages collaboration of agencies and services. The planning process for Title V is designed to produce a more effective, efficient and responsive service system for children, youth and families. The locality can best determine how to design, coordinate, and fund programs to achieve this outcome, provided that the Title V funds are not used to replace funds for existing programs.

Comment. The guideline requires a great deal of local planning before localities can become eligible for funding. This provides little incentive for many units of general local government to engage in such efforts without a strong probability of being funded.

In order to reduce the burden on the local communities, a process for awards should be employed wherein communities first apply to the State Advisory Group, and then develop their plans after there is a much greater chance of being funded.

Another option would be for OJJDP to mandate that localities should build upon existing plans, where they exist.

Response. During the initial implementation of the Title V program, some localities will have the experience to initiate and develop a three year plan in a short timeframe. In order to establish effectively operating programs during this first year, State Advisory Groups may want to consider giving priority to applicant communities that have the capacity to develop strong plans. For instance, a State Advisory Group may target communities that already have planning boards involved in broad-based prevention planning.

OJJDP encourages localities to build upon existing prevention plans which are based on a risk and protection factor approach.

Comment. OJJDP should encourage or mandate that whenever possible, localities must designate existing coalitions or boards, with prevention responsibilities similar to those required by Title V, as the Prevention Policy Board.

It may be difficult to convene a representative Prevention Policy Board of not more than 21 members. Can the Prevention Policy Board exceed 21 members?

Response. The guideline requires the local applicants to designate or form a Prevention Policy Board. OJJDP encourages the use of existing similar boards to meet the Title V requirements. This would facilitate coordination of funding sources and collaboration among agencies and governments.

Title V expressly requires that the board membership consist of not less than 15 and not more than 21 members. Localities may convene boards of more than 21 members for broad-based prevention planning, but recommendations and other actions regarding the Title V three year plan and funds can only be made by a specified board (or committee of a larger board) comprised of 15 to 21 members.

Comment. Six respondents indicated that specified groups of people need to be represented on Prevention Policy Boards including youth, families with or parents of children in the system or at risk (consumers of prevention services), and members that reflect the racial, ethnic and gender composition of the community's youth population.

Response. The additional representation described by these six respondents furthers the goal of having representative local boards. However, overly prescriptive Board requirements reduce local flexibility, particularly in the use of existing planning bodies. Therefore, OJJDP has modified the guideline to encourage the inclusion of these interests on the Prevention Policy Boards, to the maximum extent possible.

Comment. Youth development organizations should be included in the planning process and considered as a primary existing resource for prevention services—they have extensive experience in primary prevention programs.

Response. All human services agencies that in any way deal with children, youth, and families, including youth development organizations, should be involved in the planning process and considered as resources to assist in implementation of the local prevention plan. Technical assistance to States and localities is available through OJJDP to help in identifying and accessing prevention resources, including youth development organizations.

Comment. Can a Prevention Policy Board consisting of a private nonprofit organization and a local government apply for grant funds? If allowable, must the local government administer the funds?

Response. Prevention Policy Boards are not eligible to apply for a Title V grants from the States. Only units of general local government are eligible.

A private nonprofit organization and a unit of general local government could enter into a partnership to implement the Title V program, provided that the unit of general local government is the applicant and all Federal fund administrative requirements are met.

Comment. The exact duties of the Prevention Policy Board are not clear. The Board should be charged with the development of the local prevention plan.

Response. One purpose of the Board is to provide a vehicle for community commitment to and involvement in making the community a healthy place for the development of children and youth. Involving the Board in the development of the plan is one way of gaining that commitment and involvement.

The guideline has been amended to require a description of how the Prevention Policy Board will provide general oversight for developing the plan, approve the plan prior to submission to the State, and make recommendations to the responsible local agency for the distribution of funds and evaluation of funded activities.

Each Prevention Policy Board is encouraged to develop by-laws in concert with the responsible local agency to define its duties and how it will operate. Technical assistance is available through OJJDP for Board development.

Comment. The Prevention Policy Board should be charged with the mission of producing positive outcomes for youth, not just delinquency prevention.

Response. OJJDP is promoting risk and protection focused delinquency prevention as a promising strategy for the Prevention Policy Board to use in addressing the complex and varied sources of delinquent behavior in children and producing positive outcomes for youth.

Comment. Will OJJDP provide application kits for States?

Response. A sample State application is available from OJJDP.

Comment. The training on risk focused prevention is an excellent idea. However, given the limited resources available to localities to travel to the training, the training should be targeted on the localities which have been selected to receive grants. Also, a training for trainers would develop in-state capacity to deliver training in a more cost-effective manner. The use of

teleconference training should also be considered.

Response. The purpose of the training is to introduce key community leaders to risk and protection focused prevention, and enhance the localities knowledge and skills in prevention planning. Planning must occur before grants are awarded.

OJJDP hopes to provide training for State training teams in fiscal year 1995. OJJDP is also examining the use of teleconferencing as a vehicle for the more efficient delivery of training.

Comment. OJJDP should take an aggressive stance on the delivery of technical assistance.

Response. OJJDP is developing a capacity, through its Part B technical assistance contract, to provide technical assistance to every community which is developing or implementing a delinquency prevention plan.

Comment. What is the role of the State Advisory Groups in implementing the Title V program?

Response. The role of the State Advisory Group is to establish program eligibility criteria, establish procedures for submission and review of local applications, and approve or recommend approval of Title V subgrant awards.

Comment. OJJDP should provide examples of prevention plans which meet the OJJDP requirements.

Response. OJJDP is making resource material on prevention, including sample plans, available through the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, 1600 Research Boulevard, Rockville, MD 20850, Telephone (800) 638–8736.

Comment. If a prevention project serves a specific service catchment area within the boundaries of a unit of general local government, is the compliance certification limited only to the catchment area or the entire area within the boundaries of the unit of general local government? Is certification limited to only those facilities operated by the local government, exclusive of facilities located within the boundaries of the local government but operated by other governments?

Response. In order to be eligible to receive Title V funds, a unit of general local government must be certified by the State Advisory Group as in compliance with the JJDP Act mandates. The compliance certification applies to all facilities operated or contracted by the unit of general local government. The certification is not limited to a specific catchment area within the boundaries of the unit of general local government. Likewise, the certification must also include any facilities that the unit of general local government operates, contracts for, or uses inside or outside its boundaries. However, the certification does not apply to facilities operated or controlled by other governmental units within the local governmental boundaries that are not used by the local government.

Comment. Compliance with the Disproportionate Minority Confinement mandate is difficult to assess since it is just beginning to unfold in many jurisdictions.

The guidelines need to specify how the State Advisory Group's should certify unit of general local government compliance with the Disproportionate Minority Confinement where the Phase II Study has yet to be completed.

Response. The inclusion in Title V of the provision requiring local compliance with the mandates reflects an intent to use Title V funds as an inducement to bring localities into compliance. The State Advisory Groups and the State agencies should use this provision to gain the cooperation and commitment of units of general local government to assess and address disproportionate minority confinement. To certify a unit of general local government on disproportionate minority confinement compliance, the State Advisory Group must determine that the level of cooperation and commitment is satisfactory to support efforts to achieve the goals of the disproportionate minority confinement provision.

Comment. The certification of compliance with the mandates should occur at the time the subgrantee application is submitted.

Response. The guideline requires that units of general local government must obtain a certification prior to applying for an award of funds. This requirement is intended to eliminate a local government developing a three year comprehensive plan as the basis for an application for a grant which the locality is ineligible to receive.

Comment. In States where the compliance monitoring data is generated by county-wide reporting, the State Advisory Groups should be allowed to certify a city's compliance based on the overall compliance status of the county.

Response. Section 505 of the JJDP Act requires that in order for a unit of general local government to be eligible to receive a grant of Title V funds, the unit must be "in compliance with the requirements of part B of Title II." OJJDP has interpreted this to mean that the unit of general local government which is seeking eligibility to apply for an award of Title V funds must be in compliance with the four "mandates" of part B of Title II. Thus, a city's eligibility must be determined by the compliance data relevant to that city.

Comment. The language under the heading "Local Subgrantee Qualifications" is unclear. It appears to say that all units of general local government must be certified by the State Advisory Group to be in compliance with the mandates of the JJDP Act.

Response. The guideline does not require the State Advisory Group to certify all units of general local government, only those that wish to apply for Title V funds.

Comment. Is it up to each State to define "at-risk?"

Response. The guideline states that "the target population is all at-risk children in a given community." The Title V program is based on analyzing and addressing research-based risk factors which are identified in target communities. All children and youth who are exposed to these identified risk factors are the target population. In many cases, this would mean all children and youth in a target community would be considered at-risk.

Comment. Define in-kind match, and identify what type of in-kind match is allowed.

Response. In-kind match is determined by the value of goods and services received and used in the program that do not have a money cost to the grantee. In-kind match may be provided by the grantee or donated by a third party, such as a volunteer or a public or private agency. For example, the value of the time donated by a recreational counselor who is not an employee of the grantee could be counted as in-kind match. Likewise, the value of office space or equipment donated by a private corporation could also be counted as in-kind match. Note that the value of the time of an employee of the grantee who is not being compensated by grant funds, but is providing service to the project funded by the grant, would be counted as cash match.

John J. Wilson,

Acting Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[FR Doc. 94–18650 Filed 7–29–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P