

	Number of respondents	×	Annual responses	×	Hours per response	=	Burden hours
Reporting Burden:	4,300		1		0.5		2,150

Total Estimated Burden Hours: 2,150.
 Status: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Authority: Section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 35, as amended.

Dated: June 11, 2003.

Wayne Eddins,

Departmental Reports Management Officer,
 Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 03-15298 Filed 6-17-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-72-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-4817-N-08]

Notice of Proposed Information Collection for Public Comment for the Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP)

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

DATES: Comments Due Date: August 18, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Mildred M. Hamman, Reports Liaison Officer, Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing & Urban Development, 451-7th Street, SW., Room 4249, Washington, DC 20410-5000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mildred M. Hamman, (202) 708-0614, extension 4128, for copies of the proposed forms and other available documents. (This is not a toll-free number). For hearing- and speech-impaired persons, this telephone number may be accessed via TTY (Text telephone) by calling the Federal Information Relay Services at 1-800-877-8339 (toll-free).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department will submit the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended).

This notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (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; (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 collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

This notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP).

OMB Control Number: 2577-0215.

Description of the Need for the Information and Proposed Use: Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) prepare and submit an electronic submission to HUD that certifies the PHA's SEMAP performance in 14 key program areas involving the administration and operation of the Housing Choice Voucher Program. The certification profile is reviewed by HUD. Following review, HUD assigns each PHA an annual SEMAP score and performance designation denoting whether the PHA is a High, Standard or Troubled PHA. PHAs that are designated High or Standard must correct all cited deficiencies within a stand timeframe and may be required to develop a corrective action plan to resolve the areas of program non-compliance. PHAs designated Troubled must submit a corrective action plan to HUD for review and approval that outlines the areas of program non-compliance and details the corrective strategies the PHA will implement to resolve the cited deficiencies. During the recovery process, HUD will monitor the success

of the recovery progress and provide technical assistance to the PHA. Following completion of the corrective action plan, HUD will confirm the success of the recovery effort and remove the PHA from HUD's listing of troubled PHAs.

Agency form number: HUD-52648.

Members of the Affected Public: PHAs, State and Local Governments, businesses or other for-profits.

Estimation Including the Total Number of Hours Needed to Prepare the Information Collection for the Number of Respondents, Frequency of Response, and Hours of Response: The number of respondents (2500 PHAs) are required to submit an electronic SEMAP certification to HUD each year within 60 calendar days following the end of the PHA's fiscal year end date. The number of hours that are anticipated regarding the certification process should not exceed two hours per PHA per year, therefore, 5,000 hours. In addition, the number of hours that are anticipated regarding the requirement for the PHAs to examine samples of tenant file data, for quality control purposes, should not exceed 80 hours per PHA per year, therefore, 200,000 hours.

Of that number, it is anticipated that approximately 10 percent or 250 PHAs will be troubled and required to develop and implement a corrective active plan. The number of hours that are anticipated regarding the development and implementation of a corrective action plan for those PHAs that are designated troubled, varies based on the number and extent of program violations at each troubled PHA as well as the extent of correction that will be required to remedy the actual violation. The number of hours that will be required for this process are too difficult to estimate.

Status of the Proposed Information Collection: Extension is not anticipated to result in any substantive changes concerning the foregoing requirements.

Authority: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended.

Dated: June 11, 2003.

Michael Liu,

Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.

BILLING CODE 4210-33-P

Section 8 Management Assessment Program (SEMAP) Certification

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Public and Indian Housing
OMB Approval No. 2577-0215 (exp. 8/31/2003)

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 12 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and you are not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

This collection of information is required by 24 CFR sec 985.101 which requires a Public Housing Agency (PHA) administering a Section 8 tenant-based assistance program to submit an annual SEMAP Certification within 60 days after the end of its fiscal year. The information from the PHA concerns the performance of the PHA and provides assurance that there is no evidence of seriously deficient performance. HUD uses the information and other data to assess PHA management capabilities and deficiencies, and to assign an overall performance rating to the PHA. Responses are mandatory and the information collected does not lend itself to confidentiality.

Instructions Respond to this certification form using the PHA's actual data for the fiscal year just ended.

PHA Name	For PHA FY Ending (mm/dd/yyyy)	Submission Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
----------	--------------------------------	------------------------------

Check here if the PHA expends less than \$300,000 a year in Federal awards

Indicators 1 - 7 will not be rated if the PHA expends less than \$300,000 a year in Federal awards and its Section 8 programs are not audited for compliance with regulations by an independent auditor. A PHA that expends less than \$300,000 in Federal awards in a year must still complete the certification for these indicators.

Performance Indicators

1. Selection from the Waiting List. (24 CFR 982.54(d)(1) and 982.204(a))

(a) The PHA has written policies in its administrative plan for selecting applicants from the waiting list.

PHA Response Yes No

(b) The PHA's quality control samples of applicants reaching the top of the waiting list and of admissions show that at least 98% of the families in the samples were selected from the waiting list for admission in accordance with the PHA's policies and met the selection criteria that determined their places on the waiting list and their order of selection.

PHA Response Yes No

2. Reasonable Rent. (24 CFR 982.4, 982.54(d)(15), 982.158(f)(7) and 982.507)

(a) The PHA has and implements a reasonable written method to determine and document for each unit leased that the rent to owner is reasonable based on current rents for comparable unassisted units (i) at the time of initial leasing, (ii) before any increase in the rent to owner, and (iii) at the HAP contract anniversary if there is a 5 percent decrease in the published FMR in effect 60 days before the HAP contract anniversary. The PHA's method takes into consideration the location, size, type, quality, and age of the program unit and of similar unassisted units, and any amenities, housing services, maintenance or utilities provided by the owners.

PHA Response Yes No

(b) The PHA's quality control sample of tenant files for which a determination of reasonable rent was required shows that the PHA followed its written method to determine reasonable rent and documented its determination that the rent to owner is reasonable as required for (check one):

PHA Response At least 98% of units sampled 80 to 97% of units sampled Less than 80% of units sampled

3. Determination of Adjusted Income. (24 CFR part 5, subpart F and 24 CFR 982.516)

The PHA's quality control sample of tenant files shows that at the time of admission and reexamination, the PHA properly obtained third party verification of adjusted income or documented why third party verification was not available; used the verified information in determining adjusted income; properly attributed allowances for expenses; and, where the family is responsible for utilities under the lease, the PHA used the appropriate utility allowances for the unit leased in determining the gross rent for (check one):

PHA Response At least 90% of files sampled 80 to 89% of files sampled Less than 80% of files sampled

4. Utility Allowance Schedule. (24 CFR 982.517)

The PHA maintains an up-to-date utility allowance schedule. The PHA reviewed utility rate data that it obtained within the last 12 months, and adjusted its utility allowance schedule if there has been a change of 10% or more in a utility rate since the last time the utility allowance schedule was revised.

PHA Response Yes No

5. HQS Quality Control Inspections. (24 CFR 982.405(b))

A PHA supervisor (or other qualified person) reinspected a sample of units during the PHA fiscal year, which met the minimum sample size required by HUD (see 24 CFR 985.2), for quality control of HQS inspections. The PHA supervisor's reinspected sample was drawn from recently completed HQS inspections and represents a cross section of neighborhoods and the work of a cross section of inspectors.

PHA Response Yes No

6. HQS Enforcement. (24 CFR 982.404)

The PHA's quality control sample of case files with failed HQS inspections shows that, for all cases sampled, any cited life-threatening HQS deficiencies were corrected within 24 hours from the inspection and, all other cited HQS deficiencies were corrected within no more than 30 calendar days from the inspection or any PHA-approved extension, or, if HQS deficiencies were not corrected within the required time frame, the PHA stopped housing assistance payments beginning no later than the first of the month following the correction period, or took prompt and vigorous action to enforce the family obligations for (check one):

PHA Response At least 98% of cases sampled Less than 98% of cases sampled

7. Expanding Housing Opportunities. (24 CFR 982.54(d)(5), 982.153(b)(3) and (b)(4), 982.301(a) and 983.301(b)(4) and (b)(12)).
Applies only to PHAs with jurisdiction in metropolitan FMR areas.
Check here if not applicable
- (a) The PHA has a written policy to encourage participation by owners of units outside areas of poverty or minority concentration which clearly delineates areas in its jurisdiction that the PHA considers areas of poverty or minority concentration, and which includes actions the PHA will take to encourage owner participation.
PHA Response Yes No
- (b) The PHA has documentation that shows that it took actions indicated in its written policy to encourage participation by owners outside areas of poverty and minority concentration.
PHA Response Yes No
- (c) The PHA has prepared maps that show various areas, both within and neighboring its jurisdiction, with housing opportunities outside areas of poverty and minority concentration; the PHA has assembled information about job opportunities, schools and services in these areas; and the PHA uses the maps and related information when briefing voucher holders.
PHA Response Yes No
- (d) The PHA's information packet for voucher holders contains either a list of owners who are willing to lease, or properties available for lease, under the voucher program, or a list of other organizations that will help families find units and the list includes properties or organizations that operate outside areas of poverty or minority concentration.
PHA Response Yes No
- (e) The PHA's information packet includes an explanation of how portability works and includes a list of neighboring PHAs with the name, address and telephone number of a portability contact person at each.
PHA Response Yes No
- (f) The PHA has analyzed whether voucher holders have experienced difficulties in finding housing outside areas of poverty or minority concentration and, where such difficulties were found, the PHA has considered whether it is appropriate to seek approval of exception payment standard amounts in any part of its jurisdiction and has sought HUD approval when necessary.
PHA Response Yes No

8. Payment Standards. The PHA has adopted current payment standards for the voucher program by unit size for each FMR area in the PHA jurisdiction and, if applicable, for each PHA-designated part of an FMR area, which do not exceed 110 percent of the current applicable FMR and which are not less than 90 percent of the current FMR (unless a lower percent is approved by HUD). (24 CFR 982.503)

PHA Response Yes No

Enter current FMRs and payment standards (PS)

0-BR FMR _____ 1-BR FMR _____ 2-BR FMR _____ 3-BR FMR _____ 4-BR FMR _____
 PS _____ PS _____ PS _____ PS _____ PS _____

If the PHA has jurisdiction in more than one FMR area, and/or if the PHA has established separate payment standards for a PHA-designated part of an FMR area, attach similar FMR and payment standard comparisons for each FMR area and designated area.

9. Annual Reexaminations. The PHA completes a reexamination for each participating family at least every 12 months. (24 CFR 982.516)

PHA Response Yes No

10. Correct Tenant Rent Calculations. The PHA correctly calculates tenant rent in the rental certificate program and the family rent to owner in the rental voucher program. (24 CFR 982, Subpart K)

PHA Response Yes No

11. Precontract HQS Inspections. Each newly leased unit passed HQS inspection before the beginning date of the assisted lease and HAP contract. (24 CFR 982.305)

PHA Response Yes No

12. Annual HQS Inspections. The PHA inspects each unit under contract at least annually. (24 CFR 982.405(a))

PHA Response Yes No

13. Lease-Up. The PHA executes assistance contracts on behalf of eligible families for the number of units that has been under budget for at least one year.

PHA Response Yes No

- 14a. Family Self-Sufficiency Enrollment. The PHA has enrolled families in FSS as required. (24 CFR 984.105)

Applies only to PHAs required to administer an FSS program.

Check here if not applicable

PHA Response

a. Number of mandatory FSS slots (Count units funded under the FY 1992 FSS incentive awards and in FY 1993 and later through 10/20/1998. Exclude units funded in connection with Section 8 and Section 23 project-based contract terminations; public housing demolition, disposition and replacement; HUD multifamily property sales; prepaid or terminated mortgages under section 236 or section 221(d)(3); and Section 8 renewal funding. Subtract the number of families that successfully completed their contracts on or after 10/21/1998.)

or, Number of mandatory FSS slots under HUD-approved exception

b. Number of FSS families currently enrolled

c. Portability: If you are the initial PHA, enter the number of families currently enrolled in your FSS program, but who have moved under portability and whose Section 8 assistance is administered by another PHA

Percent of FSS slots filled (b + c divided by a)

14b. Percent of FSS Participants with Escrow Account Balances. The PHA has made progress in supporting family self-sufficiency as measured by the percent of currently enrolled FSS families with escrow account balances. (24 CFR 984.305)

Applies only to PHAs required to administer an FSS program.

Check here if not applicable

PHA Response Yes No

Portability: If you are the initial PHA, enter the number of families with FSS escrow accounts currently enrolled in your FSS program, but who have moved under portability and whose Section 8 assistance is administered by another PHA

Deconcentration Bonus Indicator (Optional and only for PHAs with jurisdiction in metropolitan FMR areas).

The PHA is submitting with this certification data which show that:

(1) Half or more of all Section 8 families with children assisted by the PHA in its principal operating area resided in low poverty census tracts at the end of the last PHA FY;

(2) The percent of Section 8 mover families with children who moved to low poverty census tracts in the PHA's principal operating area during the last PHA FY is at least two percentage points higher than the percent of all Section 8 families with children who resided in low poverty census tracts at the end of the last PHA FY;

or

(3) The percent of Section 8 mover families with children who moved to low poverty census tracts in the PHA's principal operating area over the last two PHA FYs is at least two percentage points higher than the percent of all Section 8 families with children who resided in low poverty census tracts at the end of the second to last PHA FY.

PHA Response Yes No If yes, attach completed deconcentration bonus indicator addendum.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the above responses under the Section 8 Management Assessment Program (SEMAP) are true and accurate for the PHA fiscal year indicated above. I also certify that, to my present knowledge, there is not evidence to indicate seriously deficient performance that casts doubt on the PHA's capacity to administer Section 8 rental assistance in accordance with Federal law and regulations.

Warning: HUD will prosecute false claims and statements. Conviction may result in criminal and/or civil penalties. (18 U.S.C. 1001, 1010, 1012; 31 U.S.C. 3729, 3802)

Executive Director, signature

Chairperson, Board of Commissioners, signature

Date (mm/dd/yyyy)

Date (mm/dd/yyyy)

The PHA may include with its SEMAP certification any information bearing on the accuracy or completeness of the information used by the PHA in providing its certification.

SEMAP Certification - Addendum for Reporting Data for Deconcentration Bonus Indicator

Date (mm/dd/yyyy) _____

PHA Name _____

Principal Operating Area of PHA _____
(The geographic entity for which the Census tabulates data)

Special Instructions for State or regional PHAs. Complete a copy of this addendum for each metropolitan area or portion of a metropolitan area (i.e., principal operating areas) where the PHA has assisted 20 or more Section 8 families with children in the last completed PHA FY. HUD will rate the areas separately and the separate ratings will then be weighted by the number of assisted families with children in each area and averaged to determine bonus points.

1990 Census Poverty Rate of Principal Operating Area _____

Criteria to Obtain Deconcentration Indicator Bonus Points

To qualify for bonus points, a PHA must complete the requested information and answer yes for only one of the 3 criteria below. However, State and regional PHAs must always complete line 1) b for each metropolitan principal operating area.

- 1) _____ a. Number of Section 8 families with children assisted by the PHA in its principal operating area at the end of the last PHA FY who live in low poverty census tracts. A low poverty census tract is a tract with a poverty rate at or below the overall poverty rate for the principal operating area of the PHA, or at or below 10% whichever is greater.
- _____ b. Total Section 8 families with children assisted by the PHA in its principal operating area at the end of the last PHA FY.
- _____ c. Percent of all Section 8 families with children residing in low poverty census tracts in the PHA's principal operating area at the end of the last PHA FY (line a divided by line b).
- Is line c 50% or more? Yes No

- 2) _____ a. Percent of all Section 8 families with children residing in low poverty census tracts in the PHA's principal operating area at the end of the last completed PHA FY.
- _____ b. Number of Section 8 families with children who moved to low poverty census tracts during the last completed PHA FY.
- _____ c. Number of Section 8 families with children who moved during the last completed PHA FY.
- _____ d. Percent of all Section 8 mover families with children who moved to low poverty census tracts during the last PHA fiscal year (line b divided by line c).
- Is line d at least two percentage points higher than line a? Yes No

- 3) _____ a. Percent of all Section 8 families with children residing in low poverty census tracts in the PHA's principal operating area at the end of the second to last completed PHA FY.
- _____ b. Number of Section 8 families with children who moved to low poverty census tracts during the last two completed PHA FYs.
- _____ c. Number of Section 8 families with children who moved during the last two completed PHA FYs.
- _____ d. Percent of all Section 8 mover families with children who moved to low poverty census tracts over the last two completed PHA FYs (line b divided by line c).
- Is line d at least two percentage points higher than line a? Yes No

If one of the 3 criteria above is met, the PHA may be eligible for 5 bonus points.

See instructions above concerning bonus points for State and regional PHAs.

[FR Doc. 03-15299 Filed 6-17-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-33-C

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Central Arizona Project, Arizona; Water Allocations

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of final decision to modify the Secretary of the Interior's record of decision.

SUMMARY: The Department hereby issues notice of its final decision to modify the 1983 Central Arizona Project (CAP) Water Allocation Decision to delete the mandatory effluent pooling provision. As supported by public comment, we now view that provision as an impediment to effluent exchanges and effective water management in central Arizona. The decision that we are publishing in this notice eliminates the requirement for a mandatory effluent pooling provision in CAP water service subcontracts. We will grant the requests by the cities of Chandler and Mesa to amend their water service subcontracts to remove the mandatory effluent pooling provision and we will delete the mandatory effluent pooling provision in other CAP municipal and industrial water service subcontracts upon request.

DATES: This final decision is effective June 18, 2003 and amends the previous allocation decision published by Secretary Watt on March 24, 1983 (48 FR 12446).

ADDRESSES: To receive a copy of the Final Environmental Assessment and responses thereto, contact John McGlothen, NEPA Specialist, Phoenix Area Office, Bureau of Reclamation, P.O. Box 81169, Phoenix, Arizona 85069, telephone: 602-216-3866.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Nelson, Contracts and Repayment Specialist, Phoenix Area Office, Bureau of Reclamation, telephone: (602) 216-3878.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. Previous Notices Related to CAP Water
- II. Background
- III. Rationale for Final Decision
- IV. Comments on the Proposed Modification and Responses
- V. Compliance with NEPA

I. Previous Notices Related to CAP Water

Previous notices related to CAP water were published in the **Federal Register** as 37 FR 28082, Dec. 20, 1972; 40 FR 17297, Apr. 18, 1975; 41 FR 45883, Oct. 18, 1976; 45 FR 52938, Aug. 8, 1980; 45

FR 81265, Dec. 10, 1980; 48 FR 12446, Mar. 24, 1983; 56 FR 29704, Jun. 28, 1991; 57 FR 4470, Feb. 5, 1992; and 57 FR 48388, Oct. 23, 1992. The above listed notices and decisions were made pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary by the Reclamation Act of 1902 as amended and supplemented (32 Stat. 388, 43 U.S.C. 391), the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057), the Colorado River Basin Project Act of September 30, 1968 (82 Stat. 885, 43 U.S.C. 1501) and in recognition of the Secretary's trust responsibility to Indian tribes.

II. Background

Following the 1983 CAP Water Allocation Decision, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD), and each of the non-Indian CAP water allottees desiring CAP water entered into three-party water service subcontracts providing for the delivery of CAP water. In order to ensure implementation of the mandatory effluent pooling provision, municipal and industrial (M&I) water service subcontractors who choose to circumvent the effluent pooling provision and directly exchange their effluent with Indian tribes are subject to a reduction in their entitlement to CAP water under their subcontracts by the amount of CAP water received from the effluent exchange.

The Department indicated in the 1983 CAP Water Allocation Decision that CAP M&I water allocations could be made more firm by execution of feasible non-potable effluent exchanges with Indian tribes. The 1983 CAP Water Allocation Decision also implemented a pooling provision whereby all M&I water service subcontractors share in the benefits of effluent exchanges. In a time of shortage of CAP water under the effluent pooling provision, the additional CAP water made available as a result of any effluent exchanges with Indian tribes would be shared by all M&I subcontractors, thereby reducing the amount of shortage for each subcontractor. The pooling provision was included in the CAP M&I water service subcontracts.

The 1983 CAP Water Allocation Decision also provided that the Department could require Indian tribes located in close proximity to metropolitan areas to take delivery of effluent in lieu of CAP water. This requirement was eliminated by a Secretarial decision published in the **Federal Register** on October 23, 1992, so that any effluent exchanges involving Indian tribes would occur on a voluntary basis.

The major cities in Maricopa County, which are the sources of most of the exchangeable effluent, prefer to exchange effluent on their own, incur all related treatment and transportation expenses, and receive any benefits from the exchange.

The notice of proposed modification of the Secretary of the Interior's Record of Decision to remove the mandatory effluent pooling provision and request for comments was published in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 38514, June 4, 2002). Implementation of the proposed modification was the only option presented.

III. Rationale for Final Decision

The Department favors elimination of the mandatory effluent pooling provision from the 1983 CAP Water Allocation Decision for the following reasons:

(1) In response to public comments submitted by the City of Phoenix in 1992 concerning the mandatory effluent pooling provision, the Department committed to re-evaluate this provision at a later date after consultation with the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) (*see* 57 FR 48389, Oct. 23, 1992). In part, the City of Phoenix stated " * * * The City of Phoenix agrees with the reasons for deleting the mandatory substitute water provision from the Indian CAP Contracts and believes that it is equally important to remove the provision from CAP M&I subcontracts that would penalize a subcontractor for entering into a direct effluent exchange with an Indian Community for CAP water." The Department acknowledged the City of Phoenix's concerns that the provisions of the effluent exchange article in the CAP M&I water service subcontracts may no longer be critical to the management of water supplies in central Arizona.

(2) The mandatory effluent pooling provision removes any incentive for a municipality to exchange effluent with an Indian tribe. The Department believes that effluent producing entities, Indian tribes, the State of Arizona, and other local organizations should be free to pursue local water management decisions that are in the best interest of the local economies, and that they should not be constrained in such water management decisions by the mandatory effluent pooling provision.

(3) ADWR now supports removing the mandatory effluent pooling provision from the 1983 CAP Water Allocation Decision and the CAP M&I water service subcontracts.

(4) CAWCD, as a party to the CAP M&I water service subcontracts, does not object to deletion of the mandatory