

digit; in Section IX(G)(3)(b), the ratio is corrected from "1:1" to "1:1.0" reversing the order of the digits; and in Section IX(G)(4)(b), the ratio is corrected from "1:1" to "1:1.0" removing the decimal point before the second digit.

In Section XII(E)(3), the reference to "Section (1)" is changed to "Section (2)."

Accordingly, FR Doc. 02-19276, the Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 Notice of Funding Availability for Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing, HOPE VI Revitalization Grants, published in the **Federal Register** on July 31, 2002 (67 FR 49766) is corrected as follows:

1. On page 49769, in column 3, revise Section VI(A)(1) to read as follows:

(1) The total amount you may request in your Revitalization application is limited to \$20 million or the sum of the amounts in Section VI(A)(2), whichever is lower.

2. On page 49775, in column 2, revise Section VIII(B)(4) to read as follows:

(4) Need for Affordable Housing in the Community—3 Points.

The applicant must demonstrate the need for affordable housing in the community. The need for affordable housing in the community is measured by a lack of supply of private market housing that can be rented at the Section 8 fair market rent (FMR), as adjusted by HUD, and in the community. To make this calculation, use the most recently published FMR, as adjusted, for a 3-bedroom apartment and apartment listings in a newspaper of general circulation that serves the majority of the community (the jurisdiction covered by the FMR). In the apartment listings, track and tabulate the rents for 3-bedroom apartments for a period of 30 consecutive days during the application preparation period, counting each 3-bedroom apartment once for the period of days it appears in the listings (e.g., if the same apartment appears in the listings every day for a period of 7 days, you would count it one time). Calculate the average market rental costs, based on your tabulations, and compare them to the FMR, as adjusted, for a 3-bedroom apartment. In your application you will document information about your analysis. Points will be awarded in accordance with one of the following, based on your analysis:

(a) You will receive 3 Points if the average market rental costs are over 130 percent of FMR.

(b) You will receive 2 Points if the average market rental costs are over 120 percent of FMR.

(c) You will receive 1 Point if the average market rental costs are over 110 percent of FMR.

(d) You will receive 0 Points if the average market rental costs are 110 percent or less of FMR or if there is inadequate information to rate this factor.

3. On page 49776, in column 2, revise the last sentence of Section IX(D)(10) to read as follows:

(10) * * * Tax credits are generally reserved annually through State Housing Finance Agencies, a directory of which can be found at <http://www.ncsha.org/ncsha/public/statehfdirectory/index.htm>

4. On page 49776, in column 3, revise the first sentence of Section IX(D)(10)(a) to read as follows:

(a) If you propose to include LIHTC equity as a development resource for your first phase of development, your application must include a LIHTC reservation letter from your State or local Housing Finance Agency. * * *

5. On page 49776, in column 3, revise Section IX(D)(10)(b)(ii) to read as follows:

(ii) The dollar amount expected from the sale of equity. If this information is not provided, HUD will count 80 percent of the total tax credit amount. The dollar amount expected from the sale of equity may be detailed in a letter from the investor, instead of in a letter from your State or local Housing Finance Agency. All other criteria in Section IX(D)(10)(b)(i)–(vii) must be included in a commitment letter from your State or local Housing Finance Agency.

6. On page 49777, in column 2, revise Section IX(G)(1)(c) to read as follows:

(c) You will receive 5 Points if the ratio is between 1:2.0 and 1:2.49.

7. On page 49777, in column 3, revise Section IX(G)(3)(a) to read as follows:

(a) You will receive 2 Points if the ratio of your documented anticipatory resources to the amount of HOPE VI funds requested for physical development activities (not including CSS or administration) is 1:1.0 or higher.

8. On page 49777, in column 3, revise Section IX(G)(3)(b) to read as follows:

(b) You will receive 0 Points if the ratio of your documented anticipatory resources to the amount of HOPE VI funds requested for physical development activities (not including CSS or administration) resources is less than 1:1.0.

9. On page 49777, in column 3, revise Section IX(G)(4)(b) to read as follows:

(b) You will receive 0 Points if the ratio of your documented collateral resources to the amount of HOPE VI funds requested for physical development activities (not including CSS or administration) is less than 1:1.0.

10. On page 49780, in column 3, revise Section XII(E)(3) to read as follows:

(3) You will receive 2 points if you meet only one of the factors described in Section (2) above.

Dated: October 15, 2002.

Michael Liu,

Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.

[FR Doc. 02-26892 Filed 10-22-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-33-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Notice of availability of the Draft Lookout Mountain Forest and Rangeland Health Project Plan, Associated Amendments to the Baker Resource Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Baker Resource Area, Vale District, Bureau of Land Management.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the Draft Lookout Mountain Forest and Rangeland Health Project Plan, Associated Amendments to the Baker Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

SUMMARY: The Baker Resource Area is providing the Lookout Mountain Forest and Rangeland Health Project DEIS for public review and comment. The planning area encompasses approximately 25,160 acres of public land managed by the Baker Resource Area, Vale District and located in Baker county in northeastern Oregon. Some of the alternatives include amendments to portions of the Baker RMP, which was originally approved in 1989. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has and will continue to work closely with all interested parties to identify the management decisions that are best suited to the needs of the public. For comments to be most helpful, they should relate to specific concerns or conflicts that are within the legal responsibilities of the BLM and they should be able to be resolved in this planning process. Specific comments are the most useful in helping us improve the analysis and in the development of the preferred alternative. In addition to public comments, the BLM is particularly interested in state, local and Tribal government comments regarding plan consistency. Documents referenced in this DEIS may be examined at the Baker Resource Area Office during normal working hours. The Baker RMP to

which the DEIS is tiered also is available for review at the Vale District and Oregon State Offices during normal working hours, and on the internet at <http://www.or.blm.gov/Vale/Planning-EnvirnAnalyses.htm>.

DATES: The comment period will end 90 days after the publication of the Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability of the DEIS in the **Federal Register**. Supplemental notices indicating the precise dates of DEIS availability and the comment period will be printed in local newspapers and sent to mailing list addressees. Comments must be received on or before the end of the comment period at the address listed below. No public meetings, open houses, or field tours of the project area have been scheduled at this time. If there is sufficient public interest, public meetings will be arranged to discuss the management alternatives and answer questions. At least 15 days public notice will be given for activities where the public is invited to attend. All meetings will be published on the Vale District Web site <http://www.or.blm.gov/Vale/Planning-EnvirnAnalyses.htm> and in the Baker City Herald and Argus-Observer (Ontario) newspapers. Comments, including names and addresses of commentors, will be available for public review. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name and/or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comment. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

ADDRESSES: The responsible field official is Penelope Dunn Woods, Baker Resource Area Manager. Written comments should be sent to Ted Davis, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist, Baker Resource Area, Bureau of Land Management, 3165 10th St., Baker City, Oregon 97814. Planning records are available at this address for inspection during normal working hours. Requests for copies of the draft plan can also be made by telephone to Ted Davis at (541) 523-1431.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The DEIS contains descriptions and analyses of five action alternatives, and a no-action alternative, each developed with differing emphasis. The range of management direction includes

commercial and precommercial timber harvest, riparian restoration activities, road relocation and decommissionings, fuel hazard reduction treatments including prescribed burning, and other land management direction. The portions of the Baker Resource Management Plan that would be most affected and amended by the action alternatives involve visual resource management and alternative road access. The action alternatives would support the National Fire Policy. There are no identified substantive adverse effects on energy resources or transmission. Public comments were considered in developing and analyzing issues and alternatives, along with input from local and Tribal governments, known interest groups, and data developed by BLM staff. The alternatives were designed to address, in different ways, the land and resource management issues identified in the early stages of the planning process. There were no requests for formal cooperator status by other federal, state, local or Tribal governments.

Authority: Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Dated: May 29, 2002.

Penelope Dunn Woods,

Field Manager, Baker Resource Area.

[FR Doc. 02-26934 Filed 10-22-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-AG-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Agency Form Submitted for OMB Review

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC or Commission) has submitted a proposed information collection package to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, (44 U.S.C. Chap. 35), requesting renewal of a currently approved collection: *USITC Reader Satisfaction Survey* (OMB No.: 3117-0188). On August 15, 2002, the USITC published in the **Federal Register** a notice of proposed information collection and request for comments on the *USITC Reader Satisfaction Survey*. No public comments to the August 15, 2002, **Federal Register** notice were received by the Commission. The USITC has also conducted a review of the proposed

information collection as required by 5 CFR 1320.8.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 16, 2002.

Purpose of Information Collection: The requested extension of a currently approved collection (one-page survey) is for use by the Commission, and complies with objectives set forth in the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Pub. L. 103-62), to establish measures to improve information on program performance, and specifically, to focus on evaluating results, quality, and customer satisfaction. The one-page survey will be placed inside the cover of certain public reports issued annually or on occasion by the Commission pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332), and including public reports that meet agency requirements for the USITC Research Program.

Public Comments Regarding the Information Collection: OMB is required to make a decision concerning extension of this currently approved collection between 30 and 60 days after publication of this notice. To be assured of consideration, comments must be received at OMB by the Desk Officer/USITC by November 22, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to: Desk Officer for U.S. International Trade Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 (telephone No. 202-395-3897). Copies of any comments should also be provided to Robert Rogowsky, Director of Operations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, who is the Commission's designated Senior Official under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Summary of Proposal

- (1) *Number of forms submitted:* One.
- (2) *Title of form:* *USITC Reader Satisfaction Survey*.
- (3) *Type of request:* Renewal of a currently approved collection.
- (4) *Frequency of use:* Annual or on occasion information gathering.
- (5) *Description of Respondents:* Interested parties receiving most public reports issued by the USITC, with the exception of Title VII reports.
- (6) *Estimated number of respondents:* 600 annually.
- (7) *Estimated total number of hours to complete the forms:* 100 hours annually.
- (8) *Recordkeeping burden:* There is no retention period for recordkeeping required.
- (9) *Response burden:* Less than 10 minutes for each individual respondent.
- (10) *Summary of the collection of information:* Single-page survey requests readers' comments about value and quality of USITC reports.