the possibility of a Permit and associated MSHCP for their activities on lands to be covered by a Permit. General activities proposed for Permit coverage include residential and commercial development, construction, and maintenance activities. The Service will conduct an environmental review of the Plan and prepare an EIS. The environmental review will analyze the proposal as well as a full range of reasonable alternatives and the associated impacts of each. The Service is currently in the process of developing alternatives for analysis. Comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties to ensure that the full range of issues related to the Permit request are addressed and that all significant issues are identified. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the Service (see ADDRESSES). The environmental review of this project will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and its implementing regulations (40 CFR parts 1500 through 1508) and other appropriate Federal laws and regulations, policies, and procedures of the Service for compliance with those regulations. It is estimated that the draft EIS will be available for public review during the third quarter of 2002.


John Engbring,
Acting Deputy Manager, California/Nevada Operations Office.

[FR Doc. 01–30025 Filed 12–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Proposed Exchange of Lands on South Fox Island, MI

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior, lead; National Park Service, Interior, cooperating; Michigan Department of Natural Resources, cooperating.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Park Service (NPS) will discontinue all activities associated with developing an environmental impact statement (EIS) for a proposed exchange of lands on South Fox Island, Leelanau County, MI. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For the various agencies, the contacts are: Mr. Craig Czarnecki, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, East Lansing Field Office, 2651 Coolidge Road, Suite 101, East Lansing, MI 48823, telephone: (517) 351–8470, facsimile: (517) 351–1443; or Ms. Elyse LaForest, National Park Service, 15 State Street, Boston, MA 02109, telephone: (617) 223–5190, facsimile: (617) 223–5164; Mr. Doug Erickson, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division, P.O. Box 30444, Lansing, MI 48909–7944; telephone: (517) 335–4316, facsimile: (517) 373–6705.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The actions that were being evaluated by this EIS were: (1) The approval by FWS of the exchange of 313 acres, acquired by the State with Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration assistance, for lands with equal monetary and wildlife restoration values; (2) the approval by the NPS for the State to exchange 105 acres with NPS interest for private lands with equal or greater monetary and recreational value; and (3) the related exchange of 220 acres of unencumbered State-owned land for fee title and easements for private lands of equal value. We published a notice of intent to prepare the EIS in the May 16, 2001, Federal Register (66 FR 27154). That notice included further information on this proposed exchange of lands.

The FWS and NPS have received a written request from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to permanently discontinue efforts on development of the EIS to analyze the proposed exchange of land on South Fox Island, Leelanau County, MI, about 30 miles west northwest of Charlevoix, in Lake Michigan. Since the actions being considered were commenced at the request of the Michigan DNR, the FWS and NPS will honor the request to discontinue efforts on preparing the EIS as of this publication date. Any proposed exchange of land with FWS or NPS interest on South Fox Island is formally discontinued. Any future consideration of a similar land exchange would be a new action requiring the initiation of a new NEPA evaluation and appropriate compliance review. The Michigan DNR is presently considering a new proposal for a land trade of 218 acres of land that has no Federal interest. Such a proposal would not require Federal approval and would therefore not be subject to NEPA compliance.


Marvin E. Moriarty,
Acting Regional Director, Region 3, Fort Snelling, MN.

[FR Doc. 01–29951 Filed 12–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of information collection under review; certification by designated school official.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval is being sought for the information collection listed below. This proposed information collection was previously published in the Federal Register on July 27, 2001 at 66 FR 39205, allowing for a 60-day public comment period. No comments were received by the Immigration and Naturalization Service during that period. The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until January 3, 2002. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR part 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, 725—17th Street, NW., Suite 10235, Washington, DC 20530; 202–395–7316. Comments may also be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Robert B. Briggs, Department Clearance Officer, Patrick Henry Building, 601 D Street, NW., Suite 1600, Washington, DC 20530. Comments may also be submitted to DOJ via facsimile to 202–514–1534.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following four points:

(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, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(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