funding eligibility of applicant activities.

Agency form numbers, if applicable: form HUD–40076–A EDI/BEDI (8/2004), form HUD 40076–B EDI/BEDI (8/2004), form HUD 40076–C EDI/BEDI (8/2004), form HUD 40076—C EDI/BEDI (8/2004), form 40076–D EDI/BEDI (8/2004), form 40076–E EDI/BEDI (8/2004).

Estimation of the total numbers of hours needed to prepare the Information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response: 50 respondents per year for the BEDI program only, with no new competitive EDI funds made available since FY 2001. Forty hours required to respond per application, once a year, for a total of 2000 hours.

Status of the proposed information collection: Expired number of previously approved collection and forms.

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

Dated: April 28, 2004.

Roy Bernardi,

Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.

[FR Doc. 04–10108 Filed 5–3–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4120–29–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–4907–N17]

Notice of Proposed Information Collection: Comment Request; Review of Health Care Facility Portfolios

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

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:* July 6, 2004.

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: Wayne Eddins, Reports Management Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., L'Enfant Plaza Building, Room 8003, Washington, DC 20410 or *Wayne__Eddins@hud.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael McCullough, Director, Office of Multifamily Housing Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW., Washington, DC 20410, telephone (202) 708–1142 (this is not a toll free number) for copies of the proposed forms and other available information.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department is submitting 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 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 the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also lists the following information:

Title of Proposal: Review of Health Care Facility Portfolios.

OMB Control Number, if applicable: 2502–0545.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use: An owner and/or an operator of health care facilities (nursing homes, intermediate care facilities, board and care facilities, or assisted living facilities) may wish to finance or refinance large groups of those facilities. Owners and/or operators of health care facilities applying for finance or refinance a minimum of 11 health care facilities, with combined estimated mortgage amount of $75 million or more during an 18 month period must furnish information that was not previously required with the application for mortgage insurance. The owner and/or operator will be acting with an FHA-approved lender or a MAP-approved lender. The information includes a Corporate Credit Analysis to be submitted to a credit rating agency (Standard & Poor's, Moody's Investor Services, Fitch IBCA, Duff & Phelps). The Corporate Credit Analysis includes detailed financial information, management policies, and corporate strategy. Owners/operators with 50 or more projects, with an estimated combined mortgage amount of $250 million or more must file, in addition to the Corporate Credit Analysis, detailed information that is required for non-portfolio owners in connection with the site visit. These large-size owners/operators must also provide information on their other properties and other business ventures not being financed.

The information is collected and evaluated, first by a rating agency and then by HUD. The purpose is to determine the financial strength and management reliability of the owner/operator. If the owner and/or the operator should go into bankruptcy or be unable to continue management of its large group of properties, to keep operating successfully would be severely jeopardized. The failure of the owner/operator could lead to large number of claims against the mortgage insurance fund.

Agency form numbers, if applicable: None.

Estimation of the total numbers of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response: The estimated number of burden hours needed to prepare the information collection is 1,200; the number of respondents is 15 generating approximately 15 annual responses; the frequency of response is on occasion; and the estimated time needed to prepare the response 80 hours (80 hours × 15 responses=1200 burden hours).

Status of the proposed information collection: Extension of currently approved collection.

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

Dated: April 23, 2004.

Sean G. Cassidy,

General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing—Deputy Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 04–10109 Filed 5–3–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–27–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–4932–C–02]

Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2004 Rural Housing and Economic Development Program: Technical Correction Regarding Questionnaire on Removal of Regulatory Barriers

AGENCY: Office of the General Counsel, HUD.

ACTION: NOFA; technical correction.

SUMMARY: On April 23, 2004, HUD published its NOFA for the FY2004 Rural Housing and Economic Development (RHED) Program. The NOFA included HUD's Questionnaire for HUD's Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers (Form HUD 27300). On April 21, 2004, HUD published a technical correction to this Questionnaire, and the revised Questionnaire was inadvertently omitted with the publication of the RHED NOFA. This notice advises of the substitution of the revised Questionnaire with the one published on April 23, 2004. No other changes are made to the RHED NOFA published on April 23, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information concerning the HUD Rural Housing and Economic Development program, contact Ms. Holly A. Kelly, Economic Development Program Specialist, or Ms. Linda L. Streets, Community Development Specialist, Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Room 7137, Washington, DC 20410–7000; telephone 202–708–2290 (this is not a toll-free number). Persons with speech or hearing impairments may access this number via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Information Relay Service at 800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 23, 2004 (69 FR 22320), HUD published its NOFA for the FY2004 Rural Housing and Economic Development (RHED) Program. The NOFA included HUD's Questionnaire for HUD's Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers (Form HUD 27300) (Questionnaire). (See 69 FR at 22372 through 22376). On April 21, 2004 (69 FR 21664), HUD published a technical correction to this Questionnaire. The revised Questionnaire was inadvertently omitted with the publication of the RHED NOFA. This notice advises of the substitution of the revised Questionnaire with the one published on April 23, 2004. A copy of the correct form is included with this notice published in today's **Federal Register**, and the form is also available on HUD's Web site at *http://www.hud.gov/grants/index.cfm*.

No other changes are made to the RHED NOFA published on April 23, 2004.

Dated: April 28, 2004.

Aaron Santa Anna,

Assistant General Counsel for Regulations.

BILLING CODE 4610–67–P

America's Affordable Communities Initiative	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development	OMB approval no. 2510-0013 (exp. 01/01/2006)

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 3 hours. This includes the time for collecting, reviewing, and reporting the data. The information will be used for encourage applicants to pursue and promote efforts to remove regulatory barriers to affordable housing. Response to this request for information is required in order to receive the benefits to be derived. This agency may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Questionnaire for HUD's Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers

Part A. Local Jurisdictions. Counties Exercising Land Use and Building Regulatory Authority and Other Applicants Applying for Projects Located in such Jurisdictions or Counties [Collectively, Jurisdiction]

	1	2
1. Does your jurisdiction's comprehensive plan (or in the case of a tribe or TDHE, a local Indian Housing Plan) include a "housing element? A local comprehensive plan means the adopted official statement of a legislative body of a local government that sets forth (in words, maps, illustrations, and/or tables) goals, policies, and guidelines intended to direct the present and future physical, social, and economic development that occurs within its planning jurisdiction and that includes a unified physical plan for the public development of land and water. If your jurisdiction does not have a local comprehensive plan with a "housing element," please enter no. If no, skip to question # 4.	☐ No	☐ Yes
2. If your jurisdiction has a comprehensive plan with a housing element, does the plan provide estimates of current and anticipated housing needs, taking into account the anticipated growth of the region, for existing and future residents, including low, moderate and middle income families, for at least the next five years?	☐ No	☐ Yes
3. Does your zoning ordinance and map, development and subdivision regulations or other land use controls conform to the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan regarding housing needs by providing: a) sufficient land use and density categories (multifamily housing, duplexes, small lot homes and other similar elements); and, b) sufficient land zoned or mapped "as of right" in these categories, that can permit the building of affordable housing addressing the needs identified in the plan? (For purposes of this notice, "as-of-right," as applied to zoning, means uses and development standards that are determined in advance and specifically authorized by the zoning ordinance. The ordinance is largely self-enforcing because little or no discretion occurs in its administration.). If the jurisdiction has chosen not to have either zoning, or other development controls that have varying standards based upon districts or zones, the applicant may also enter yes.	☐ No	☐ Yes
4. Does your jurisdiction's zoning ordinance set minimum building size requirements that exceed the local housing or health code or is otherwise not based upon explicit health standards?	☐ Yes	☐ No

5. If your jurisdiction has development impact fees, are the fees specified and calculated under local or state statutory criteria? If no, skip to question #7. Alternatively, if your jurisdiction does not have impact fees, you may enter yes.	☐ No	☐ Yes
6. If yes to question #5, does the statute provide criteria that sets standards for the allowable type of capital investments that have a direct relationship between the fee and the development (nexus), and a method for fee calculation?	☐ No	☐ Yes
7. If your jurisdiction has impact or other significant fees, does the jurisdiction provide waivers of these fees for affordable housing?	☐ No	☐ Yes
8. Has your jurisdiction adopted specific building code language regarding housing rehabilitation that encourages such rehabilitation through gradated regulatory requirements applicable as different levels of work are performed in existing buildings? Such code language increases regulatory requirements (the additional improvements required as a matter of regulatory policy) in proportion to the extent of rehabilitation that an owner/developer chooses to do on a voluntary basis. For further information see HUD publication: "*Smart Codes in Your Community: A Guide to Building Rehabilitation Codes*" (www.huduser.org/publications/destech/smartcodes.html)	☐ No	☐ Yes
9. Does your jurisdiction use a recent version (i.e. published within the last 5 years or, if no recent version has been published, the last version published) of one of the nationally recognized model building codes (i.e. the International Code Council (ICC), the Building Officials and Code Administrators International (BOCA), the Southern Building Code Congress International (SBCI), the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO), the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)) without significant technical amendment or modification. In the case of a tribe or TDHE, has a recent version of one of the model building codes as described above been adopted or, alternatively, has the tribe or TDHE adopted a building code that is substantially equivalent to one or more of the recognized model building codes? Alternatively, if a significant technical amendment has been made to the above model codes, can the jurisdiction supply supporting data that the amendments do not negatively impact affordability.	☐ No	☐ Yes
10. Does your jurisdiction's zoning ordinance or land use regulations permit manufactured (HUD-Code) housing "as of right" in all residential districts and zoning classifications in which similar site-built housing is permitted, subject to design, density, building size, foundation requirements, and other similar requirements applicable to other housing that will be deemed realty, irrespective of the method of production?	☐ No	☐ Yes

11. Within the past five years, has a jurisdiction official (i.e., chief executive, mayor, county chairman, city manager, administrator, or a tribally recognized official, etc.), the local legislative body, or planning commission, directly, or in partnership with major private or public stakeholders, convened or funded comprehensive studies, commissions, or hearings, or has the jurisdiction established a formal ongoing process, to review the rules, regulations, development standards, and processes of the jurisdiction to assess their impact on the supply of affordable housing?	☐ No	☐ Yes
12. Within the past five years, has the jurisdiction initiated major regulatory reforms either as a result of the above study or as a result of information identified in the barrier component of the jurisdiction's "HUD Consolidated Plan?" If yes, attach a brief list of these major regulatory reforms.	☐ No	☐ Yes
13. Within the past five years has your jurisdiction modified infrastructure standards and/or authorized the use of new infrastructure technologies (*e.g.* water, sewer, street width) to significantly reduce the cost of housing?	☐ No	☐ Yes
14. Does your jurisdiction give "as-of-right" density bonuses sufficient to offset the cost of building below market units as an incentive for any market rate residential development that includes a portion of affordable housing? (As applied to density bonuses, "as of right" means a density bonus granted for a fixed percentage or number of additional market rate dwelling units in exchange for the provision of a fixed number or percentage of affordable dwelling units and without the use of discretion in determining the number of additional market rate units.)	☐ No	☐ Yes
15. Has your jurisdiction established a single, consolidated permit application process for housing development that includes building, zoning, engineering, environmental, and related permits? Alternatively, does your jurisdiction conduct concurrent, not sequential, reviews for all required permits and approvals?	☐ No	☐ Yes
16. Does your jurisdiction provide for expedited or "fast track" permitting and approvals for all affordable housing projects in your community?	☐ No	☐ Yes
17. Has your jurisdiction established time limits for government review and approval or disapproval of development permits in which failure to act, after the application is deemed complete, by the government within the designated time period, results in automatic approval?	☐ No	☐ Yes
18. Does your jurisdiction allow "accessory apartments" either as: a) a special exception or conditional use in all single-family residential zones or, b) "as of right" in a majority of residential districts otherwise zoned for single-family housing?	☐ No	☐ Yes
19. Does your jurisdiction have an explicit policy that adjusts or waives existing parking requirements for all affordable housing developments?	☐ No	☐ Yes
20. Does your jurisdiction require affordable housing projects to undergo public review or special hearings when the project is otherwise in full compliance with the zoning ordinance and other development regulations?	☐ Yes	☐ No
Total Points:		

Part B. State Agencies and Departments or Other Applicants for Projects Located in Unincorporated Areas or Areas Otherwise Not Covered in Part A

		1	2
1	Does your state, either in its planning and zoning enabling legislation or in any other legislation, require localities regulating development have a comprehensive plan with a "housing element?" If no, skip to question # 4	☐ No	☐ Yes
2.	Does you state require that a local jurisdiction's comprehensive plan estimate current and anticipated housing needs, taking into account the anticipated growth of the region, for existing and future residents, including low, moderate, and middle income families, for at least the next five years?	☐ No	☐ Yes
3.	Does your state's zoning enabling legislation require that a local jurisdiction's zoning ordinance have a) sufficient land use and density categories (multifamily housing, duplexes, small lot homes and other similar elements); and, b) sufficient land zoned or mapped in these categories, that can permit the building of affordable housing that addresses the needs identified in the comprehensive plan?	☐ No	☐ Yes
4.	Does your state have an agency or office that includes a specific mission to determine whether local governments have policies or procedures that are raising costs or otherwise discouraging affordable housing?	☐ No	☐ Yes
5.	Does your state have a legal or administrative requirement that local governments undertake periodic self-evaluation of regulations and processes to assess their impact upon housing affordability address these barriers to affordability?	☐ No	☐ Yes
6.	Does your state have a technical assistance or education program for local jurisdictions that includes assisting them in identifying regulatory barriers and in recommending strategies to local governments for their removal?	☐ No	☐ Yes
7.	Does your state have specific enabling legislation for local impact fees? If no skip to question #9.	☐ No	☐ Yes
8.	If yes to the question #7, does the state statute provide criteria that sets standards for the allowable type of capital investments that have a direct relationship between the fee and the development (*nexus*) and a method for fee calculation?	☐ No	☐ Yes
9.	Does your state provide significant financial assistance to local governments for housing, community development and/or transportation that includes funding prioritization or linking funding on the basis of local regulatory barrier removal activities?	☐ No	☐ Yes

10. Does your state have a mandatory state-wide building code that a) does not permit local technical amendments and b) uses a recent version (i.e. published within the last five years or, if no recent version has been published, the last version published) of one of the nationally recognized model building codes (i.e. the International Code Council (ICC), the Building Officials and Code Administrators International (BOCA), the Southern Building Code Congress International (SBCI), the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO), the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)) without significant technical amendment or modification? Alternatively, if the state has made significant technical amendment to the model code, can the state supply supporting data that the amendments do not negatively impact affordability?	☐ No	☐ Yes
11. Has your jurisdiction adopted specific building code language regarding housing rehabilitation that encourages such rehabilitation through gradated regulatory requirements applicable as different levels of work are performed in existing buildings? Such code language increases regulatory requirements (the additional improvements required as a matter of regulatory policy) in proportion to the extent of rehabilitation that an owner/developer chooses to do on a voluntary basis. For further information see HUD publication: "*Smart Codes in Your Community: A Guide to Building Rehabilitation Codes*" (www.huduser.org/publications/destech/smartcodes.html)	☐ No	☐ Yes
12. Within the past five years has your state made any changes to its own processes or requirements to streamline or consolidate the state's own approval processes involving permits for water or wastewater, environmental review, or other State-administered permits or programs involving housing development. If yes, briefly list these changes.	☐ No	☐ Yes
13. Within the past five years, has your state (i.e., Governor, legislature, planning department) directly or in partnership with major private or public stakeholders, convened or funded comprehensive studies, commissions, or panels to review state or local rules, regulations, development standards, and processes to assess their impact on the supply of affordable housing?	☐ No	☐ Yes
14. Within the past five years, has the state initiated major regulatory reforms either as a result of the above study or as a result of information identified in the barrier component of the states' "Consolidated Plan submitted to HUD?" If yes, briefly list these major regulatory reforms.	☐ No	☐ Yes
15. Has the state undertaken any other actions regarding local jurisdiction's regulation of housing development including permitting, land use, building or subdivision regulations, or other related administrative procedures? If yes, briefly list these actions.	☐ No	☐ Yes
Total Points:		

[FR Doc. 04–10107 Filed 5–3–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4210–67–C

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Information Collection Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Approval Under the Paperwork Reduction Act; Division of International Conservation Requests for Proposals

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (We) has submitted the collection of information described below to OMB for approval under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act. An estimate of the information collection burden is included in this notice. If you wish to obtain copies of the proposed information collection requirement, related forms, and/or explanatory material, contact the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer at the address listed below.

DATES: OMB has up to 60 days to approve or disapprove information collection but may respond after 30 days. Therefore, to ensure maximum consideration, you must submit comments on or before June 3, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments on this information collection to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior at OMB–OIRA via facsimile or electronic mail: (202) 395–6566 (fax); or *OIRA_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov* (electronic mail). Please provide a copy of your comments to the Fish and Wildlife Service's Information Collection Clearance Officer via postal mail, electronic mail, or facsimile: 4401 N. Fairfax Dr., MS 222 ARLSQ, Arlington, VA 22203; *Anissa_Craghead@fws.gov* (electronic mail); or (703) 358–2269 (fax).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request a copy of the information collection submission, explanatory information, and/or related forms, contact Anissa Craghead, Information Collection Clearance Officer, at 703–358–2445 or *Anissa_Craghead@fws.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OMB regulations at 5 CFR 1320, which implement provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), require that interested members of the public and affected agencies be given an opportunity to comment on information collection and record keeping activities (*see* 5 CFR 1320.8(d)). We have submitted a request to OMB to approve: (1) The revision of the collection of information for four of our multinational species conservation grant fund requests for proposals (Form numbers 3–2214 through 3–2217), and (2) the addition of two new requests for proposals (Form numbers 3–2263, 3–2263S and 3–2264). We are requesting a three-year term of approval for this information collection activity. Federal agencies 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. The OMB control number for this collection of information is 1018–0123.

Revisions to the currently approved requests for proposals include updating application forms to: (1) Comply with new Government-wide policy directing all funding programs to request Dun & Bradstreet registration from all applicants; (2) reformat to comply with new Government-wide policies prescribing a standard RFP format; (3) add additional instructions for applicants; (4) request from domestic applicants the submission of standard forms 424, 424a, 424b and DI 2010; and (5) reformat the application cover page form to fit on one page. In addition, two new requests for proposals have been added to the information collection in order to meet our obligations under the requirements of the Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere. Form 3–2263, one of the two new requests for proposals, and its associated form will be translated into Spanish for the convenience of our Mexican applicants. The Spanish version of that form is assigned form number 3–2263S. The new requests for proposals (forms 3–2263, 3–2263S, and 3–2264) are noted in the table below. In addition, this information collection is currently titled, ''Multinational Species Conservation Fund Requests for Proposals.'' Due to the addition of two new requests for proposals that are not part of the Multinational Species Conservation Fund, we are proposing to change the title of this information collection to ''Division of International Conservation Requests for Proposals.''

We published a notice inviting public comment on this information collection in the **Federal Register** on December 10, 2003 (68 FR 68939). The comment period lasted until February 9, 2004. We did not receive any comments during the comment period. In addition to the Federal Register notice, the Division of International Conservation solicited comments from several previous applicants related to: the clarity of the submission instructions; the estimated length of time to complete a submission; and any suggestions for improving the documents. The comments received included: (1) A suggestion to define a length limit, font size, font type, paper size, and margin sizes for the narrative portion of each proposal; (2) a suggestion to rearrange the contents of the Request for Proposals; (3) positive support for the development of an online fillable cover page form; and (4) confirmation that increasing our estimate of hours to complete a request to 12 hours was appropriate and more accurate. We did not make any changes based on the comments received. In the case of item (1), we did not choose to restrict items such as paper size or font type as our non-domestic applicants do not always have access to letter-size paper and/or access to computers that would allow conformity to our word processing standards. In addition, our proposal requests range drastically in the amounts requested and in complexity of work to be conducted. For this reason, we did not choose to limit the length of the narrative. Regarding item (2), we followed the new standard proposal format and standard data elements as prescribed by OMB for posting Federal financial assistance funding opportunities and did not consider ourselves responsible for considering public comment on the prescribed format. This notice provides an additional 30 days in which to comment on the information collection.

The information obtained from the first four requests for proposals listed below will be used to select conservation projects for grant funding in accordance with the criteria in several Acts of Congress. The Acts of Congress include the African Elephant Conservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4201–45), the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 5301–06), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4261–4266), and the Great Ape Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 6301–6303). The information obtained from the final two requests for proposals will be used to select conservation projects for grant funding in accordance with the U.S. Government's obligations under the Western Hemisphere Convention, and authorized by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531–44). The following table lists the requests for proposals, with their respective burden estimates, that we submitted to OMB for approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act.