

provide services to the gaming facility; and provides for dispute resolution over any breaches of this Compact.

Dated: April 13, 2009.

**George T. Skibine,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Economic Development.*

[FR Doc. E9-9260 Filed 4-21-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-4N-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Indian Affairs

#### Indian Gaming

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of amendment to approved Tribal-State compact.

**SUMMARY:** This notice publishes the approval of the Seventh Amendment to the Agreement between the Crow Tribe of Montana and the State of Montana Concerning Class III Gaming.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* April 22, 2009.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paula Hart, Acting Director, Office of Indian Gaming, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary—Policy and Economic Development, Washington, DC 20240, (202) 219-4066.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 11 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (IGRA), Public Law 100-497, 25 U.S.C. 2710, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the **Federal Register** notice of the approved Tribal-State compacts for the purpose of engaging in Class III gaming activities on Indian lands. This Amendment increases the number of Class III video gambling machines available for play to 400; allows for Tribal gaming operations to be located anywhere on the reservation; increases the prize limit for Class III gaming to \$2,000.00; increases the wager limit on Tribally owned machines to \$5.00; and sets out the technical and internal control standards for Class III gaming machines on the reservation.

Dated: April 15, 2009.

**George T. Skibine,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Economic Development.*

[FR Doc. E9-9258 Filed 4-21-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-4N-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Indian Affairs

#### Rate Adjustments for Indian Irrigation Projects

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of rate adjustments.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) owns, or has an interest in, irrigation projects located on or associated with various Indian reservations throughout the United States. We are required to establish irrigation assessment rates to recover the costs to administer, operate, maintain, and rehabilitate these projects. We are notifying you that we have adjusted the irrigation assessment rates at several of our irrigation projects and facilities to reflect current costs of administration, operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* The irrigation assessment rates shown in the tables as final are effective as of January 1, 2009.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For details about a particular BIA irrigation project or facility, please use the tables in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section to contact the regional or local office where the project or facility is located.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A Notice of Proposed Rate Adjustment was published in the **Federal Register** on October 30, 2008 (73 FR 64629) to propose adjustments to the irrigation assessment rates at several BIA irrigation projects. The public and interested parties were provided an opportunity to submit written comments during the 60-day period that ended December 29, 2008.

#### Did the BIA defer or change any proposed rate increases?

Yes. At the Fort Belknap, Fort Peck, and Uintah Irrigation Projects, the project operations and maintenance (O&M) has been contracted by the water users and/or tribes. Based on the budget submitted by the water users at Fort Belknap, the rate was only raised to \$14.75 instead of \$20.00 per acre. Based on the budget submitted by the water users at Fort Peck, the rate was only raised to \$24.00 instead of \$25.75 per acre. Based on the budget submitted by the water users at Uintah, the rate is raised to \$15.00 instead of the previously proposed \$13.70 per acre.

#### Did the BIA receive any comments on the proposed irrigation assessment rate adjustments?

Written comments were received related to the proposed rate adjustments for the San Carlos Irrigation Project—Joint Works, the Wapato Irrigation Project, and the Wind River Irrigation Project.

#### What issues were of concern to the commenters?

Individuals and entities commenting on the proposed rates raised concerns about one or more of the following issues: (1) How funds are expended for O&M costs; (2) the BIA's trust responsibility for projects; (3) the BIA's responsibility to enhance idle land tracts to make them productive; (4) the efficiencies of contracting with water users groups to perform O&M to save costs; and (5) how rate increases impact the local agricultural economy and individual land owners.

Commenters raised concerns specific to the Wind River Irrigation Project (WRIP), asserting that: (1) The BIA is responsible for delivery of the full amount of water quantified in the Big Horn Decree; (2) the WRIP should not be considered self-supporting for irrigation O&M funding and requires Federal assistance; and (3) the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho Tribes and their members should not be subsidizing non-Indian lessee water users.

A commenter raised concerns specific to the San Carlos Irrigation Project—Joint Works, asserting that: (1) The number of BIA personnel required to operate and maintain the project is too high; (2) the BIA should maintain the project wells; (3) anticipated project expenses for FY 2010 will be higher; and (4) the BIA is budgeting too much for emergency reserves.

The Yakama Nation raised concerns specific to the Wapato Irrigation Project, stating that the Yakama Nation does not believe that the BIA has authority to charge the Yakama Nation and its members irrigation O&M charges as provided in this notice.

#### How does the BIA respond to concerns regarding how funds are expended for O&M costs?

The BIA considers the following expenses when determining an irrigation project's budget: Project personnel costs; materials and supplies; vehicle and equipment repairs; equipment; capitalization expenses; acquisition expenses; rehabilitation costs; maintenance of a reserve fund for contingencies or emergencies; and other expenses that we determine are