

**Section 513—Public Housing Income Targeting**

Section 513 amends section 16 of the USHA to establish, among other things, public housing deconcentration requirements, annual requirements for admitting families with incomes below thirty percent (30%) of area median income, and related income targeting requirements. The guidance for this section was provided at pages 8199 to 8200.

In the guidance provided for Section 513, HUD noted in paragraph (1)(b) on page 8200 (first column) that there are three further limitations on a PHA's use of fungibility with respect to income targeting for public housing. ("Fungibility" refers to the fact that to a certain extent, the PHA can credit section 8 tenant-based admissions above the minimum targeting requirements to satisfy its public housing targeting requirements.) The February 18, 1999 guidance provided that fungibility "credits" only can be used to drop the annual requirement for housing very poor families, as described above, below 40 percent of newly available units in public housing, by the lowest of three amounts. These three amounts were described in the notice at page 8200, under paragraphs designated (1)(a), (b) and (c). The amount provided by paragraph (1)(b) was the number of units that (i) are in projects located in census tracts having a poverty rate of 30% or more, and (ii) are made available for occupancy by and actually occupied by very poor families.

Correction. Paragraph (1)(b) in the first column of page 8200 should have read as follows:

(b) The number of public housing units that (i) are in public housing projects located in census tracts having a poverty rate of 30% or more, and (ii) are made available for occupancy by, and actually occupied in that year by, families other than very poor families.

**Section 514—Repeal of Federal Preferences in the Public Housing and Section 8 Programs**

Section 514 provides for the permanent repeal of Federal preferences, including the permanent repeal of the right of certain public housing residents to retain federal preference status on the Section 8 certificate and voucher waiting list; and also authorizes local preferences. (The elimination of the previous statutory preference for the admission of elderly, disabled and displaced persons before other single persons in the public housing and Section 8 programs was accomplished by section 506 rather than section 514.)

In the guidance for this section on page 8201 (first column) HUD advised, among other things, that because there is no indication in the QHWRA that Congress intended to disrupt existing local preferences, existing local preferences may remain without further immediate PHA action or may be altered in the manner authorized before enactment of the QHWRA.

Clarification. HUD wishes to clarify that with respect to the manner in which existing local preferences were authorized to be altered before the enactment of QHWRA, HUD is referring to the manner authorized under prior HUD appropriations acts. For the purposes of selecting families from the waiting list, prior HUD appropriations acts provided that a PHA may establish, after public notice and an opportunity for public comment, a written system of preferences for selection that is not inconsistent with the comprehensive housing affordability strategy (consolidated plan) of either the State or local general government of the PHA's jurisdiction.

**Section 535—Demolition, Site Revitalization, Replacement Housing, and Tenant-Based Assistance Grants for Public Housing Projects**

Section 535 amends section 24 of the USHA and provides the continued authority for the HOPE VI program, and establishes application selection and grant requirements.

In the guidance for this section on page 8204 (first column), HUD noted the exemption from the requirements of section 18 of the USHA for severely distressed public housing that is demolished in accordance with a revitalization plan.

Clarification. HUD wishes to clarify that where HOPE VI funds are awarded for demolition only, no revitalization plan is required, and therefore there is no exemption from the requirements of section 18 of the USHA.

**Section II—New Guidance****Section 564—Public Housing Management Assessment Program**

Section 564 makes several amendments to section 6(j) of the USHA. One of these amendments excludes small PHAs (PHAs with less than 250 units) from an independent assessment that otherwise would be required once a small PHA has been designated as troubled. Section 6(j)(2)(B)(i) limits this independent assessment to PHAs with more than 250 units.

Action Guidance. Section 6(j)(2)(B)(i) is effective immediately

**Section III—Future Guidance**

As HUD noted in the February 18, 1999 Notice, the QHWRA makes significant changes to HUD's public housing and Section 8 programs. With many of the changes immediately effective, substantial responsibility is placed on PHAs and Section 8 owners to implement these changes promptly. HUD remains committed to working closely with its public housing and Section 8 partners to make the changes in its public housing and Section 8 programs a success. HUD will continue to provide any additional guidance that may be needed through direct notices to PHAs and Section 8 owners, additional **Federal Register** notices, or through other means that may be determined appropriate.

Dated: April 22, 1999.

**Harold Lucas,**

*Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.*

[FR Doc. 99-10733 Filed 4-29-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-33-P

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR****Fish and Wildlife Service****Information Collection Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for Renewal Under the Paperwork Reduction Act**

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** We have submitted the information collection requirements to evaluate visitor responses to the recreation fee demonstration program in our National Wildlife Refuges to OMB for approval under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before June 1, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments and suggestions on specific requirements directly to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of the Interior Desk Officer, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503; and a copy to our Information Collection Clearance Officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [MS 222 ARLSQ], 1849 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20240.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Doug Staller, Chief, Branch of Visitor Services, Division of Refuges, (703) 358-2029; or Dr. Jonathan G. Taylor, Research Social Scientist, U.S.

Geological Survey, Fort Collins, CO (970) 226-9438.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We submitted the following proposed information collection clearance requirement to OMB for review and approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-13. OMB has up to 60 days to approve or disapprove information collection. To ensure maximum consideration, OMB should receive public comments by June 1, 1999. We may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. We previously published a 60-day notice inviting public comment on this information collection in the **Federal Register** on February 16, 1999 (64 FR 7661).

We invite comments on: (1) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to 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.

Congress authorized a recreation fee demonstration program in Pub. L. 104-134. We were one of the four agencies mandated to implement the program and evaluate its impact on the visiting public. We designed this study to scientifically evaluate visitor reactions and impact of the fees on visitation to the national wildlife refuges (NWR); U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, Social Economic and Institutional Analysis Section will conduct the survey under a cooperative agreement with us.

Although we planned to end this survey on December 15, 1998 with a joint report issued on March 31, 1999, a November, 1998 GAO report (GAO-RCED-99-7) recommended that only one year of data collection for the recreation fee demonstration program was insufficient. GAO concluded that this collection should continue for further evaluation. Section 328 of H.R. 4193 (subsequently in FY 1999 Interior appropriations) authorized extension of the program through FY 2001.

To represent the various types of fee changes as well as fee demonstration

refuges, we selected six distinct fee programs and nine refuges for inclusion in the study. These include (1) New entrance fees [Sacramento NWR, CA and Aransas NWR, TX]; (2) increased entrance fees [Dungeness NWR, WA]; (3) new annual passes [Chincoteague NWR, VA and Crab Orchard NWR, IL]; (4) new hunt fees [St. Catherine's Creek NWR, MS and Balcones Canyonlands NWR, TX]; (5) non-hunt use permits [Buenos Aires NWR, AZ] and (6) non-fee adjustments [Piedmont NWR, GA]. We will survey random samples of individuals using these refuges. We plan to use as part of the evaluation process a survey questionnaire to assess the different fee programs. We will distribute an on-site questionnaire during the peak season to a random sample of the visiting public and obtain a minimum of 400 completed surveys for each fee type. We will obtain additional information from Sacramento NWR to allow for examination of credit card entrances as well as new entrance fees in general. We will ask no questions of the participants, simply note payment by credit card. Overall, this will result in a total sample of 2,400 respondents. The margin of error for each fee type is  $\pm 5\%$  at the 95% confidence level. The information gained from this survey will provide a viability of the fee program among the visiting public. The lead project officer is Dr. Jonathan G. Taylor, Research Social Scientist, phone 970/226/9438, 4512 McMurry Avenue, Fort Collins, CO 80525-3400.

**Title:** Evaluation of visitor responses to recreation fee demonstration program.

**Bureau for number:** None.

**Frequency of collection:** On Occasion.

**Description of the respondents:**

Individuals and Households.

**Number of respondents:** 2,400.

**Estimated completion time:** 10 minutes.

**Burden estimate:** 400 hours.

Dated: April 6, 1999.

**Allyson Rowell,**

*Assistant Director for Refuges and Wildlife.*

[FR Doc. 99-10804 Filed 4-29-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### Issuance of Permit for Marine Mammals

On December 28, 1998, a notice was published in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 63, No. 248, Page 71497, that an application had been filed with the Fish and Wildlife Service by Dennis Leistico

for a permit (PRT-006163) to import one polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) trophy taken from the M'Clintock Channel population, Canada for personal use.

Notice is hereby given that on April 7, 1999, as authorized by the provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, *as amended* (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) the Fish and Wildlife Service authorized the requested permit subject to certain conditions set forth therein.

On February 19, 1999, a notice was published in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 64, No. 33, Page 8397, that an application had been filed with the Fish and Wildlife Service by Walter Prothero for a permit (PRT-004450) to import one polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) trophy taken from the Lancaster Sound population, Canada for personal use.

Notice is hereby given that on April 7, 1999, as authorized by the provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, *as amended* (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) the Fish and Wildlife Service authorized the requested permit subject to certain conditions set forth therein.

On February 19, 1999, a notice was published in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 64, No. 33, Page 8397, that an application had been filed with the Fish and Wildlife Service by Thomas LaBarge for a permit (PRT-003976) to import one polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) trophy taken from the Lancaster Sound population, Canada for personal use.

Notice is hereby given that on April 7, 1999, as authorized by the provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, *as amended* (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) the Fish and Wildlife Service authorized the requested permit subject to certain conditions set forth therein.

On February 19, 1999, a notice was published in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 64, No. 33, Page 8397, that an application had been filed with the Fish and Wildlife Service by Danny Sardella for a permit (PRT-004449) to import one polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) trophy taken from the Lancaster Sound population, Canada for personal use.

Notice is hereby given that on April 7, 1999, as authorized by the provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, *as amended* (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) the Fish and Wildlife Service authorized the requested permit subject to certain conditions set forth therein.

On February 19, 1999, a notice was published in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 64, No. 33, Page 8397, that an application had been filed with the Fish and Wildlife Service by Jerry Rubenstein for a permit (PRT-004001) to import one polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) trophy taken from the Lancaster Sound population, Canada for personal use.