

sport hunted from the Lancaster Sound polar bear population in Canada for personal use.

Applicant: Howard Neal Stoneback, West Bloomfield, MI, PRT-054556.

The applicant requests a permit to import a polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) sport hunted from the Western Hudson Bay polar bear population in Canada for personal use.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has information collection approval from OMB through March 31, 2004, OMB Control Number 1018-0093. Federal Agencies may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a current valid OMB control number.

Dated: March 22, 2002.

Anna Barry,

Senior Permit Biologist, Branch of Permits, Division of Management Authority.

[FR Doc. 02-7968 Filed 4-1-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-U

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Jamul Indian Village 101 Acre Fee-to-Trust Transfer and Casino Project, San Diego County, CA

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public that the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), with the cooperation of the Jamul Indian Village and the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC), intends to gather information necessary for preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed 101 acre Fee-to-Trust Transfer and Casino Project in San Diego County, California. The purpose of the proposed action is to help meet the land base and economic needs of the Jamul Indian Village.

DATES: Comments on the scope and implementation of this proposal must arrive by April 22, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Mail or hand carry written comments to Ronald M. Jaeger, Regional Director, Pacific Region, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, California 95825-1846.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Allan, (916) 978-6043.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Jamul Indian Village is located in eastern San Diego County, approximately one mile south of the community of Jamul. The

project area is bordered on the north by Melody Lane, on the west by vacant and residentially developed land, on the south by vacant land and on the east by State Route 94. State Route 94 provides direct access to downtown San Diego, approximately 20 miles to the west, where it intersects with Interstate 5.

The Jamul Indian Village proposes that 101 acres of land be taken into trust, that a casino be constructed on existing trust land, and that parking and other facilities supporting the casino be constructed on the 101 acre trust acquisition. The gaming facility will be managed by Lakes Kean Argovitz Resorts-California, LLC (LKAR-CA), on behalf of the tribal government, pursuant to the terms of the management agreement between the tribal government and LKAR-CA. The BIA will serve as the Lead Agency for National Environmental Policy Act compliance. The NIGC, which is responsible for approval of the gaming management contract, will be a Cooperating Agency.

The BIA released an Environmental Assessment (EA) on the proposed action for public comment on February 1, 2001. The EA was revised in response to public comment and released as a final EA, with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), on November 16, 2001. The FONSI was based on, among other factors, mitigation of potentially significant impacts to traffic on highway 94. After three parties appealed the FONSI, the BIA determined the mitigation proposed for traffic to be too provisional, hence an EIS would be required.

The BIA and NIGC propose to use the extensive public comments received during the public review of the EA as scoping comments for the EIS. Areas of environmental concern identified include, in addition to traffic, threatened and endangered species, wildlife habitat and conservation areas, wastewater disposal, air quality, and socio-economic impacts. The range of issues to be addressed may be further expanded based on comments received during the scoping process.

Authority

This notice is published in accordance with section 1503.1 of the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500 through 1508), implementing the procedural requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), and the Department of the Interior Manual (516 DM 1-6), and is in the exercise of authority delegated to the Assistant

Secretary—Indian Affairs by 209 DM 8.1.

Dated: March 14, 2002.

Neal A. McCaleb,

Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 02-7948 Filed 4-1-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-W7-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[WO-220-1020-PB-24 1A]

OMB Approval Number 1004-0068; Information Collection Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has submitted a request to reinstate an existing approval to collect the information listed below to the Office of Management and Budget under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). On July 31, 2001, the BLM published a notice in the *Federal Register* (66 FR 39525) requesting comments on this information collection. The comment period ended on October 1, 2001. The BLM received no comments from the public in response to that notice. You may obtain copies of the collection of information and related forms and explanatory material by contacting the BLM Information Collection Clearance Officer at the telephone number listed below.

The OMB is required to respond to this request within 60 days but may respond after 30 days. For maximum consideration your comments and suggestions on the requirement should be made within 30 days directly to the Office of Management and Budget, Interior Department Desk Officer (1004-0068), Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Washington, DC 20503. Please provide a copy of your comments to the Bureau Information Collection Clearance Officer (WO-630), 1849 C St., NW., Mail Stop 401 LS, Washington, DC 20240.

Nature of Comments: We specifically request your comments on the following:

1. Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper functioning of the BLM, including whether the information will have practical utility;

2. The accuracy of the BLM's estimate of the burden of collecting the information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

3. The quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and