

but were introduced late in the surnaming process, the mistake did not affect the BIA analysis and probably did not influence decision-makers, who saw an earlier draft. Nevertheless, the signed FD did have the mistakes in it, and a reevaluation of the evidence with a correct understanding of the 1878 and 1880 censuses was made during this reconsideration.

The PF found that the Cowlitz métis were part of the Lower Cowlitz which was recognized in 1855 during treaty negotiations. The FD found also that in 1878 and 1880, the Office of Indian Affairs recognized both the Lower and Upper Cowlitz, originally separate bands which amalgamated during the second half of the 19th century. The Lower Cowlitz census of 1878 listed 66 individuals, but it only named heads of households, none of whom had "métis" names. This census did not name "wives," "children," and "relatives in families," and thus, it is impossible to determine if métis "mixed-bloods" were among those listed as unnamed Lower Cowlitz. No names at all are available for the 1880 enumeration.

The PF, the transcripts of a technical assistance meeting held on-the-record as provided by the regulations at 83.10(j)(2), and the contextual discussion concerning the relationship between the métis mixed-bloods and the other Cowlitz in the FD, show that the Cowlitz métis were associated with the Cowlitz tribe through kinship, marriage, and association. Other evidence showed that the cultural distinctiveness of the métis was just beginning to emerge by the 1870's. Even if the OIA in the later 1800's did not specifically designate the métis as part of the tribe, the métis nonetheless interacted as part of the tribe at that time and in the following decades.

The evidence available does not define the full composition of the Lower and Upper Cowlitz bands as recognized by the Government in 1880. Further, how the Cowlitz defined their tribal members and how the government defined them may have differed. Under the regulations, the totality of the evidence is sufficient to establish by a reasonable likelihood that the Cowlitz métis were part of the Lower Cowlitz at its point of last unambiguous recognition. The misstatements concerning the 1878 and 1880 censuses do not impact the result of the FD.

The second issue considered by the AS-IA concerned whether the BIA misapplied the burden of proof under 25 CFR 83.6(d). The Secretary, however, limited her referral of this issue to "the portion that pertains to the application of the burden of proof in the context of

unambiguous previous federal recognition." The Quinault Indian Nation submitted comments positing that the Cowlitz métis "half-bloods" were not part of the 1855 Lower Cowlitz tribe nor the 1878 and 1880 Lower Cowlitz band, and therefore the CIT could not show by a reasonable likelihood that its members descended from the previously acknowledged tribe. The AS-IA determined that the CIT demonstrated by substantial evidence that the Lower Cowlitz tribe was recognized in 1855, 1878 and 1880, and that the Upper Cowlitz tribe was recognized in 1878 and 1880. The AS-IA determined also that there is a reasonable likelihood that the Cowlitz métis were part of the previously recognized tribe in 1855, as well as of the Lower Cowlitz previously recognized in 1878 and 1880. The Upper Cowlitz and Lower Cowlitz having amalgamated during the second half of the 19th century, the AS-IA determined that there is a reasonable likelihood that the current petitioner has evolved from the previously acknowledged tribes.

Even if the métis were not part of the Lower Cowlitz recognized in 1878 and 1880, the analysis under the criteria could fall back on the earlier 1855 date of previous acknowledgment for the Lower Cowlitz, while maintaining the later date for the Upper Cowlitz. The PF already demonstrated that the Lower Cowlitz tribe was federally recognized in 1855 when they participated in treaty negotiations and that the métis were members of that entity. The petitioner has established that it descends from the previously recognized tribe in 1855.

The FD demonstrated substantial evidence, including the "Milroy" censuses, that in 1878 and 1880, the Upper Cowlitz and Lower Cowlitz were federally acknowledged as an Indian tribe. The FD found by a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner descends from these entities recognized in 1855, 1878 and 1880 and amalgamated through actions of the OIA in the last decades of the 1800's. The reconsidered FD affirms that analysis with the knowledge that the métis were not specifically named on the 1878 censuses and presumably were not named in the 1880 OIA censuses.

The reconsidered final determination supplements the original final determination and supersedes it to the extent the original is inconsistent with the reconsidered final determination. In conjunction with the original final determination, the reconsidered final determination is an amended final determination for the CIT petitioner and effective upon publication of the notice

of this reconsidered determination in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: December 31, 2001.

**Neal A. McCaleb,**

*Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 02-299 Filed 1-2-02; 2:14 pm]

**BILLING CODE 4310-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Office of Violence Against Women Office; Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice of information collection under review; New collection. Data Collection from Grantees from the Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus Program.

The Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Violence Against Women Office, has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with emergency review procedures of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. OMB approval has been requested by January 4, 2002. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. If granted, the emergency approval is only valid for 180 days. Comments should be directed to OMB, Office of Information Regulation Affairs, (202) 395-7860, Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20530.

During the first 60 days of this same review period, a regular review of this information collection is also being undertaken. All comments and suggestions, or questions regarding additional information, to include obtaining a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions, should be directed to Cathy Poston, Attorney/Advisor, Violence Against Women Office, Office of Justice Programs, 810 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20531, or facsimile at (202) 305-2589.

Request written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the

proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### Overview of This Information

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* New collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Data Collection from Grantees from the Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus Program.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* None. Violence Against Women Office, Office of Justice Programs, United States Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be as or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Institutions of Higher Education. Other: None.

The Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus Program was authorized through Section 826 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 to make funds available to institutions of higher education to combat domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking crimes.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:* The time burden of the 45 respondents to complete the data collection form is 60 minutes per application.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total annual hour burden to complete the data collection forms is 45 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Ms. Brenda E. Dyer, Deputy, Clearance Office, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 1600, 601D Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: December 18, 2001.

#### Brenda E. Dyer,

Department Deputy Clearance Officer,  
Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 02-159 Filed 1-3-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Immigration and Naturalization Service

#### Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice of Information Collection Under Review; Employment Authorization Document.

The Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service has submitted the following information collection request (ICR) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for sixty days until March 5, 2002.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### Overview of This Information Collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved information collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Employment Authorization Document.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form I-765. Adjudications Division, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Individuals or households. The information collection on this form is used by the INS to

determine eligibility for the issuance of the employment document.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 1,873,296 responses at 3.42 hours per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 6,406,672 annual burden hours.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions, or additional information, please contact Richard A. Sloan 202-514-3291, Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Room 4034, 425 I Street, NW., Washington, DC 20536. Additionally, comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time may also be directed to Mr. Richard A. Sloan.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, 601 D Street, NW., Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: December 28, 2001.

#### Richard A. Sloan,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[FR Doc. 02-216 Filed 1-3-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-10-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Office of Justice Programs

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

**ACTION:** 60-day notice of information collection under review: Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired: The Annual Survey of Jails, Forms CJ-5, CJ-5A, CJ-5B.

The Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to