The Affordable Housing Group of North Carolina, Inc.	NC	300,000.00
Ho-Chunk Community Development Corporation	NE	300,000.00
Community Area Resource Enterprise (CARE 66)	NM	299,125.00
Dona Ana County Colonias Development Council	NM	203,590.00
New Mexico Mortgage Finance Authority	NM	300,000.00
Pueblo of Pojoaque	NM	300,000.00
San Juan Pueblo Tribal Council	NM	300,000.00
JobStart Chautauqua	NY	300,000.00
WSOS Community Action Commission	OH	300,000.00
Citizen Potawatomi Community Development Corporation	OK	300,000.00
Corporation De Desarrollo Economico de Ceiba, Cd	PR	300,000.00
Community Development Corporation of Marlboro County	SC	285,000.00
Spartanburg Leased Housing Corporation	SC	300,000.00
Four Bands Community Fund, Inc.	SD	300,000.00
Mazaska Owecaso Otipi Financial, Inc.	SD	266,000.00
Community Development Corporation of Brownsville	TX	300,000.00
El Paso Collaborative for Community and Economic Development	TX	300,000.00
La Gloria Development Corporation	TX	300,000.00
Motivation Education & Training, Inc.	TX	300,000.00
Community Action Center	WA	294,242.00
Diocese of Yakima Housing Services	WA	300,000.00
Skokomish Tribal Nation	WA	300,000.00
Wind River Development Fund	WY	219,983.00
		$16,802,721.00

[FR Doc. E8–5456 Filed 3–18–08; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

U.S. Geological Survey

Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

AGENCY: U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Interior.

ACTION: Notice of an extension of an information collection (1028–0079).

SUMMARY: To comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), we are notifying the public that we will submit to OMB an information collection request (ICR) to renew approval of the paperwork requirements for ''North American Breeding Bird Survey, (1 USGS form).'' This notice provides the public an opportunity to comment on the paperwork burden of this form.

DATES: Submit written comments by May 19, 2008.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on this information collection to the Department of the Interior, USGS, via:

- E-mail: *atravnic@usgs.gov.* Use Information Collection Number 1028–0079 in the subject line.
- FAX: (703) 648–7069. Use Information Collection Number 1028–0079 in the subject line.
- Mail or hand-carry comments to the Department of the Interior; USGS Clearance Officer, U.S. Geological Survey, 807 National Center, Reston, VA 20192. Please reference Information Collection 1028–8–0079 in your comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Keith L. Pardieck at (301) 497–5843.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: North American Breeding Bird Survey.

OMB Control Number: 1028–0079.

Form Number: 840.

Abstract: Respondents supply the U.S. Geological Survey with avian population data for more than 600 North American bird species. The raw survey data, resulting population trend estimates, and relative abundance estimates will be made available via the Internet and through special publications, for use by Government agencies, industry, education programs, and the general public.

We will protect information from respondents considered proprietary under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and its implementing regulations (43 CFR Part 2), and under regulations at 30 CFR 250.197, ''Data and information to be made available to the public or for limited inspection.'' Responses are voluntary. No questions of a ''sensitive'' nature are asked.

Frequency: Annually.

Estimated Number and Description of Respondents: Approximately 1,500 individuals skilled in avian identification will participate.

Estimated Number of Responses: 2500.

Annual burden hours: 27,500.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping ''Hour'' Burden: The currently approved ''hour'' burden for this form is 12,500 hours. We estimate the public reporting burden averages 11 hours per response. This includes the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the information.

Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping ''Non-Hour Cost'' Burden: Mileage costs are on average $44.85 per response. This includes an approximate 100-mile round trip for data collection.

Public Disclosure Statement: The PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*) provides that an 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. Until OMB approves a collection of information, you are not obligated to respond.

Comments: Before submitting an ICR to OMB, PRA section 3506(c)(2)(A) (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*) requires each agency'' * * * to provide notice * * * and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information * * *'' Agencies must specifically solicit comments to: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the agency to perform its duties, including whether the information is useful; (b) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

To comply with the public consultation process, we publish this

Federal Register notice announcing that we will submit this ICR to OMB for approval. The notice provided the required 60-day public comment period.

USGS Information Collection Clearance Officer: Alfred Travnicek, 703–648–7231.

Dated: March 12, 2008.

Susan D. Haseltine,

Associate Director of Biology.

[FR Doc. E8–5447 Filed 3–18–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4311–AM–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Final Determination Against Federal Acknowledgment of the Steilacoom Tribe of Indians

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Final Determination.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to 25 CFR 83.10(l)(2), notice is hereby given that the Department of the Interior (Department) declines to acknowledge the group known as the Steilacoom Tribe of Indians (STI) of 1515 Lafayette Street, P.O. Box 88419, Steilacoom, Washington 98388, c/o Mr. Danny Marshall, as an Indian tribe within the meaning of Federal law. This notice is based on a determination that the petitioner does not satisfy four of the seven mandatory criteria for acknowledgment, specifically §§ 83.7(a), 83.7(b), 83.7(c), and 83.7(e), as defined in 25 CFR part 83. Consequently, the STI does not meet the requirements for a government-to-government relationship with the United States.

DATES: This determination is final and will become effective on June 17, 2008, pursuant to § 83.10(l)(4), unless a request for reconsideration is filed pursuant to § 83.11.

ADDRESSES: Requests for a copy of the Summary Evaluation under the Criteria should be addressed to the Office of the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Attention: Office of Federal Acknowledgment, 1951 Constitution Avenue, NW., MS: 34B–SIB, Washington, DC 20240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: R. Lee Fleming, Director, Office of Federal Acknowledgment, (202) 513–7650.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 14, 2000, the Department issued a proposed finding (PF) that the STI was not an Indian tribe within the meaning of Federal law because the STI did not meet four of the seven mandatory criteria for Federal acknowledgment as an Indian tribe. The Department published a notice of the PF in the **Federal Register** on February 7, 2000 (65 FR 5880). The **Federal Register** notice initiated a 180-day comment period during which any individual or organization wishing to comment on the proposed finding could submit factual or legal arguments or evidence to support or rebut the PF.

The Department extended the comment period on several occasions. On March 27, 2007, the Department sent a letter to the STI outlining a plan to bring the regulatory comment and response periods to a close. The Department reopened and extended the comment period for 90 days to allow the STI and other parties to file comments. The Department also noted that this comment period could be extended further if the petitioner filed a detailed description of a work plan, a description of the work it had already completed, and established good cause for any further extension. To receive consideration for another extension of the comment period, the STI had to mail its request by June 14, 2007; otherwise, the comment period would close on July 6, 2007.

On June 25, 2007, the Department received a letter from the STI requesting an extension of the comment period by an additional 180 to 300 days. The letter's June 20, 2007, postmark was six days later than the June 14, 2007, deadline, and the petitioner's letter contained neither a work plan nor a description of work completed. The Department declined to extend the comment period again. The final comment period closed without the Department having received any additional comments. After the comment period closed, the regulatory 60-day response period began. The STI submitted no response materials during this period, which ended on September 4, 2007.

On November 2, 2007, the Department sent a consultation letter to the STI and several interested and third parties informing them that in mid-November the Department planned to begin evaluating the evidence for the FD on the STI petition. None of the parties raised an objection or responded in any other way to the Department's intention to begin preparation of the FD. However, due to workload considerations, the Department was not able to begin work in November. On January 7, 2008, the Department sent a letter to the STI and interested parties stating that it would begin the evaluation for the FD on January 15, 2008, and complete it by March 15, 2008.

During the comment period and the extended comment periods the STI commented only on the PF's analysis for 83.7(b) for the period from after the 1950s. Overall, given the petition's significant deficiencies in meeting criteria 83.7(a), (b), (c), and (e), the STI's comments were limited and did not substantively address the PF. Two neighboring federally recognized Indian tribes—the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation and the Nisqually Indian Tribe of the Nisqually Reservation—submitted third-party comments opposing acknowledgment of the STI. None of the material submitted changed the conclusions of the PF.

The STI claims to descend as a group from the historical Steilacoom Indian tribe that occupied the territory north of the Nisqually River up to Point Defiance in the western part of the state of Washington. The Hudson's Bay Company founded Fort Nisqually in the 1830s, and the STI claims that its Steilacoom ancestors worked at the fort for over two decades. The STI claims its ancestors signed the Medicine Creek Treaty (10 Stat. 1132) in 1854 and that its ancestors resided briefly on the reservations created by the treaty. The STI further contends that some of these Indians left the reservations and settled in ''community pockets'' in their traditional homelands. These Indians, the STI claims, are the ''ancestors of the modern-day Steilacoom tribe'' who have formed ''an unbroken line of leadership and a continuous existence of community pockets within their traditional territory.''

The PF found that over 90 percent of the 612 STI members documented that they are Indian descendants, but only three of them documented descent from persons described in 19th and early 20th century documents as Steilacoom Indians. The PF found that STI members have Indian ancestry from other sources. One source of Indian ancestry is marriages between Indian women from various Indian tribes in the Pacific Northwest and employees of the Hudson's Bay Company. Just under two-thirds of the members descend from Indian women who were not Steilacoom and who, between 1839 and 1870, married employees of the Hudson's Bay Company who had come to the Pacific Northwest. The descendants of these marriages could not be classified as a métis, or mixed-blood, group descended from the historical Steilacoom band because the Indian wives came from a wide variety of tribal origins, including the Nisqually, Puyallup, Cowlitz, S'Klallam, Chimacum, Quinault, Duwamish, Skokomish, Yakima, and Snohomish Indian tribes. Furthermore,