

drug courts are more effective than traditional court settings in decreasing the time needed to reach permanent placements for children; increasing the frequency of successful parent-child reunifications and decreasing the frequency of terminations of parental rights; decreasing the time children spend in foster care; and reducing child welfare recidivism.

An intent-to-treat sampling model will be used for the treatment groups at each site during a 2.5-year recruitment window. The expected number of treatment group subjects varies by site based on program capacity, as illustrated in the table below. Comparison groups will be recruited in three of the four sites, with equal numbers of comparison group

participants at each site; no comparison group will be used in San Diego because that county has implemented a system-wide reform. Interview data will be sought from all persons included in the administrative datasets.

Interview participants will take part in a baseline interview within one month of their dispositional hearing and three follow-up interviews. Follow-up One will take place six months later, Follow-Up Two will take place 12 months after baseline, and Follow-Up Three will take place 24 months after baseline. The interview tool will assess participants' perceptions of the services they are receiving and their interactions with the court, treatment, and child welfare systems; their understanding of what they need to do in order to be

reunified with their children; and their feelings of empowerment and control over the process. Each interview will last approximately one hour. Administrative data, including child welfare and treatment data, will be collected annually to ascertain the type, frequency, and timeliness of services received and to capture the crucial child welfare outcomes of interest, including the timing and type of permanency plans for children, the length of time children spend in foster care, and subsequent involvement in the child welfare system.

The project is scheduled over a four-year time period. Therefore, the estimates in the table below are annualized based on planned activities for the entire four years.

	No. of respondents	Responses/respondent	Hours/response	Total burden hrs.
Client Interviews	1,295	4	1.0	5,180
Tracking telephone calls	1,295	3	0.17	220
Total	1,295	5,400
4-yr. Annual Average	1,295	1,350

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

Dated: January 23, 2003.

Richard Kopanda,

Executive Officer, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-1998 Filed 1-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4162-20-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Vacancies for Committee Members on the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) Negotiated Rulemaking Committee

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: There are several vacancies on the committee that the Department has convened to negotiate regulations to implement the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. We propose filling these vacancies by naming current committee alternates and other qualified individuals. Tribes, tribal organizations, and individual tribal members who believe that their interests will not be adequately represented by the persons identified in this notice may

submit comments on the proposed selection, apply for membership on the committee, or submit other nominations.

DATES: Comments on this notice and nominations for committee members must be received no later than February 13, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Send nominations and comments to Mr. LeRoy Gishi, Chief, Division of Transportation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, MS-4058-MIB, 1849 C Street NW., Washington, DC 20240; or fax to (202) 208-4696. Nominations and comments received by BIA will be available for inspection at the address listed above from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. LeRoy Gishi, (202) 208-4359.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 11, 1999, in a **Federal Register** notice (64 FR 6825), the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) announced selection of members of the TEA-21 Negotiated Rulemaking Committee to develop proposed regulations for the Indian Reservation Roads program under the Negotiated Rulemaking Act and Section 1115 of TEA-21. The Secretary selected two primary tribal Committee representatives and two tribal alternates from nominees from tribes in each of the twelve Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Regions. In addition, the Secretary selected five additional primary tribal Committee members from various

regions to balance interests on the Committee and selected eleven Federal representatives. The Committee began negotiations on the proposed regulations in March 1999 and the Secretary published proposed regulations in August 2002.

The Committee must reconvene in early 2003 to consider public comments and make recommendations for final regulations. During the tenure of the Committee, some primary tribal Committee members have become unable to continue to serve on the Committee. In order to continue to fulfill the requirements of TEA-21 for tribal Committee membership, the Secretary must appoint representatives to fill tribal member vacancies on the Committee. Tribes, tribal organizations, and individual tribal members who believe that their interests will not be adequately represented by the persons identified in this notice may submit comments on the proposed selection, apply for membership on the committee, or submit other nominations by the date in the "DATES" section.

The Secretary is required to use a negotiated rulemaking process to issue regulations governing the Indian Reservation Roads program and establish a formula for allocating all contractible funds among Indian tribes for fiscal year 2000 and subsequent years (23 U.S.C. Section 202, as amended by TEA-21 (Pub. L. 105-178, 112 Stat. 154.)) The Secretary is also required to:

(1) Apply the procedures of negotiated rulemaking under subchapter III of chapter 5 of Title 5 (the Negotiated Rulemaking Act) in a manner that reflects the unique government-to-government relationship between the Indian tribes and the United States; and

(2) Ensure that the membership of the committee includes only representatives of the Federal Government and of geographically diverse small, medium, and large Indian tribes. For more information on the TEA-21 Negotiated Rulemaking Committee see 67 FR 51328, dated August 7, 2002.

Based upon recommendations for proposed regulations and a funding formula the TEA-21 Negotiated Rulemaking Committee provided to the Secretary, the Secretary published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on August 7, 2002 (67 FR 51328). The public comment period for the NPRM ended on November 7, 2002. The Committee must now reconvene to consider the public comments and make recommendations to the Secretary for final regulations and a funding formula. The Secretary must fill the primary tribal member vacancies on the Committee to ensure that tribal interests on the Committee, required by TEA-21, are balanced to include:

(1) Members of geographically diverse small, medium, and large Indian tribes;

(2) Members of tribes identified as Direct Services, Self-Determination, and Self-Governance tribes; and

(3) Members of tribes with various levels and types of experience in the diverse concerns of transportation development and management (e.g., jurisdictional issues, complexity of transportation systems, climatic concerns, environmental issues, geographic isolation, etc.).

The Secretary proposes to fill primary tribal Committee membership vacancies by naming current tribal Committee alternates where alternates have participated in the Committee negotiations and, where those alternates are not available, naming other qualified individuals to fill vacancies of primary tribal Committee members. Current primary tribal Committee members who were originally selected to serve on the Committee are designated with an asterisk (*). The Secretary proposes that the TEA-21 Negotiated Rulemaking Committee be comprised of the following primary and alternate tribal Committee members when it reconvenes:

Representatives of Tribes, Tribal Organizations, and Individual Indians

Great Plains Region

*Pete Red Tomahawk, Transportation Planner, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Fort Yates, ND
Sherman Wright, Transportation Planner, Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Rosebud, SD
Alternate: Gilbert Red Dog, Northern Plains Transportation Advisory Council Member, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Eagle Butte, South Dakota

Southwest Region

Edmond Gonzalez, Civil Engineer, Pueblo of San Ildefonso, Albuquerque, NM
Shannon McKenna, Lieutenant Governor, Pueblo of Nambe, Albuquerque, NM
*Edward Little, Mescalero Apache Tribe, Mescalero, NM

Southern Plains Region

*Chuck Tsoodle, Tribal Roads & Transit Director, Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma, Carnegie, OK
*Tim Ramirez, Tribal Roads Director, Prairie Band of Potawatami Nation, Mayetta, KS
Alternates: Bill Tall Bear, Program Coordinator-Transportation Planner, Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, Concho, OK
Ray Ball, Transportation Planner, Kaw Nation, Kaw City, Oklahoma

Rocky Mountain Region

*John Smith, Transportation Planner, Shoshone & Arapaho Tribes, Fort Washakie, WY
Caleb Shields, Chief of Staff, Ft. Peck Tribe, Poplar, MT
Alternates: John Healy, Transportation Planner, Fort Belknap Tribes, Harlem, MT
Cordell Ringel, Engineer, Montana-Wyoming Tribal Leaders Council, Billings, MT

Eastern Region

*Eddie Tullis, Chairman, Poarch Band of Creek Indians, Atmore, AL
*Jody Clark, Transportation Manager, Seneca Nation of Indians, Salamanca, NY

Alaska Region

*Loretta Bullard, President, Kawarek, Inc., Nome, AK
*Al Ketzler Sr., Fairbanks, AK
*Gideon James, Tribal Operations Director, Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government, Venetie, AK
Alternates: Dugan Nielsen, Director, Land & Resources, Bristol Bay Native Association, Dillingham, AK
Dan Moreno, Transportation Planner, Sitka Tribe, Juneau, AK

Midwest Region

*Jim Garrigan, Director of Tribal Roads, Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Red Lake, MN
*Mike Christensen, Tribal Roads Committee, Lac Du Flambeau Chippewa, Lac du Flambeau, WI
Alternate: Bruce Danforth, Public Works Area Manager, Oneida Nation, Oneida, WI

Eastern Oklahoma Region

*Robert Endicott, Transportation Planner, Cherokee Nation, Tahlequah, OK
William McKee Eastern Shawnee of Oklahoma, Miami, OK
Alternate: Braven Dyer, Transportation Director, Chickasaw Nation, Ada, Oklahoma

Navajo Region

*Sampson Begay, Tribal Council, Navajo Nation, Window Rock, AZ
Lawrence Morgan, Tribal Council, Navajo Nation, Window Rock, AZ

Western Region

*Robyn Burdette, Chairperson, Summit Lake Paiute Tribe, Winnemucca, NV
Rita Martinez, Councilwoman, Tohono O'odham Nation, Sells, AZ
*Alex Cabillo Hualapai Tribe, Peach Springs, AZ

Northwest Region

*Michael Marchand, Colville Business Council, Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians, Nespelem, WA
*Dave Whitener, Squaxin Island Tribe, Shelton, WA
*Della Cree, Community Development Planner, Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, ID
Alternates: Andy Kampkoff, Construction Manager, Lummi Indian Business Council, Bellingham, WA
Mike Clement, Economic Development Manager, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, Warm Springs, OR

Pacific Region

*Vlayn McCovey, Yurok Tribe, Eureka, CA
*Mervin Hess, Vice Chairman, Bishop Indian Tribe, Bishop, CA
Alternate: Randolph Feliz, Tribal Vice Chair Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, Hopland, CA
In addition, the Secretary announces the following Federal Committee representatives:
Robert Baracker, Designated Federal Official, BIA Southwest Regional Office
LeRoy Gishi, Chief, BIA Division of Transportation
Justin P. Patterson, Consultant, Department of the Interior (Retired)

Mike Black, Regional Road Engineer, Rocky Mountain Region
 Robert Martin, Regional Road Engineer, BIA Alaska Region
 Harold Riley, Road Engineer, BIA Navajo Region
 Todd Kennedy, Regional Road Engineer, BIA Midwest Region
 Mike Smith, Director, BIA Office of Tribal Services
 Paul Los, Program Coordinator, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation
 Vivian Philbin, Attorney, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation
 Robert Sparrow, Federal Lands Highway Program Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation

If you believe that tribal interests will not be adequately represented by any tribal person identified in the updated tribal committee membership, you may apply or nominate another person for membership on the committee. Each application or nomination must be received by the date above and must include:

(1) The name of the nominee, business address, and telephone and fax numbers.

(2) The tribal interest(s) to be represented by the nominee (based on the requirements of TEA-21 listed above);

(3) Evidence that the applicant or nominee is authorized to represent parties related to the interest(s) the person proposed to represent;

(4) The reasons that the proposed members of the committee identified in this notice do not represent the interests of the person submitting the application or nomination; and

(5) Your name, address, telephone number, and the name of the tribe or tribal organization with which you are affiliated.

Dated: January 17, 2003.

Aurene M. Martin,

Acting Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.
 [FR Doc. 03-2043 Filed 1-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-LY-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Proposed Finding Against Federal Acknowledgment of the Golden Hill Paugussett Tribe

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of proposed finding.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to 25 CFR 83.10(h), notice is hereby given that the Assistant

Secretary—Indian Affairs (AS-IA) proposes to decline to acknowledge that the Golden Hill Paugussett Tribe (GHP), c/o Mr. Aurelius H. Piper, Jr., Suite 236, 1440 Whalley Avenue, New Haven, Connecticut, 06515, is an Indian tribe within the meaning of Federal law. This notice is based on a determination that the petitioner does not satisfy all seven of the criteria set forth in 25 CFR Part 83.7, specifically criteria (b), (c), and (e), and therefore does not meet the requirements for a government-to-government relationship with the United States.

DATES: Publication of the AS-IA's notice of the proposed finding in the **Federal Register** initiates a 180-day comment period during which the petitioner, interested parties, informed parties, and the public may submit arguments and evidence to support or rebut the evidence relied upon in the proposed finding. Interested or informed parties must provide a copy of their comments to the petitioner. The regulations, 25 CFR 83.10(k), provide petitioners a minimum of 60 days to respond to any submissions on the proposed findings received from interested and informed parties during the comment period.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the proposed finding or requests for a copy of the report which summarizes the evidence, reasoning, and analyses that are the basis for this proposed finding, or a list of parties in the litigation, should be addressed to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Branch of Acknowledgment and Research, 1849 C Street, NW., Mailstop 4660-MIB, Washington, DC 20240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: R. Lee Fleming, Chief, Branch of Acknowledgment and Research, (202) 208-3592.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published in accordance with authority delegated by the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) to the AS-IA by 209 DM 8.

The GHP group's petition #81 is being considered under a court-approved negotiated agreement in pending litigation. This agreement, entered December 14, 2001, established time lines for the submission of materials to the Department of the Interior (Department) and deadlines for submitting comments, and issuing a proposed finding. The agreement neither modifies the regulatory time periods following the issuance of the proposed finding, nor modifies the criteria or the standards required to demonstrate that the criteria are met.

The GHP group submitted a letter of intent to the Department on April 13, 1982, to petition for Federal

acknowledgment as an Indian tribe, a documented petition on April 12, 1993, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) placed them on the "Ready, Waiting for Active Consideration" list on November 21, 1994. The BIA processed the GHP petition under 25 CFR 83.10(e), which permits an evaluation on only one criterion if the petition and response to the technical assistance review indicates that there is little or no evidence to demonstrate that a group can meet the criteria in 83.7(e), (f), or (g).

The Department published a notice of the proposed finding on June 8, 1995, in the **Federal Register** that declined to acknowledge that the GHP existed as an Indian tribe (60 FR 30430). The Department found the evidence clearly established that the GHP group did not meet the mandatory criterion 83.7(e), descent from a historical Indian tribe. Following an evaluation of the evidence submitted during the comment periods, the AS-IA issued a final determination on September 16, 1996 (61 FR 50501). The AS-IA concluded that the evidence did not establish a reasonable likelihood of the validity of the facts (see 25 CFR 83.6(d)) that the petitioner descended from a historic tribe, or that William Sherman, the ancestor through whom the GHP claimed tribal descent, had ancestry either from the historical Golden Hill tribe or from any other identified historical Indian tribe.

The GHP petitioner filed a request for reconsideration of the final determination with the Interior Board of Indian Appeals (IBIA) on December 26, 1996, pursuant to 25 CFR 83.11(b)(2). Another group, the Golden Hill Paugeesukg Tribal Nation, also requested reconsideration, claiming to be the actual governing body of the petitioning group. On September 8, 1998, the IBIA affirmed the decision not to acknowledge the GHP group as an Indian tribe, but referred five allegations of error to the Secretary (33 IBIA 4, 1998).

On December 22, 1998, the Secretary, without evaluating the merits, requested the AS-IA to address the five issues and provide a reconsidered determination in accordance with the applicable regulations. The AS-IA recused himself of this decision, and, on May 24, 1999, the Deputy AS-IA issued a reconsidered decision and an order that the GHP petition be considered under all seven mandatory criteria of the acknowledgment regulations. The Deputy AS-IA also ordered active consideration of the petition be suspended until the GHP petitioner made additional submissions, which it did, whereupon the BIA resumed active consideration.