

Information collection	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Responses per annum	Burden hour per response	Annual burden hours	Hourly cost per response	Annual cost
HUD-5084	2,771	1	2,771	1.5	4,156	\$34	\$141,321
HUD-5087	50	1	50	3	150	56	8,400
HUD-50071	10	1	10	0.5	5	56	280
HUD-50075.1	300	1	300	2.2	660	34	22,440
HUD-51000	590	1	590	1	590	34	20,060
HUD-51001	2,550	12	30,600	3.5	107,100	34	3,641,000
HUD-51002	1,600	5	8,000	1	8,000	34	272,000
HUD-51003	500	2	1,000	1.5	1,500	34	51,000
HUD-51004	500	2	1,000	2.5	2,500	34	85,000
HUD-51915	1,315	1	1,315	3	3,945	34	134,130
HUD-51915-A	1,315	1	1,315	3	3,945	34	134,130
HUD-51971-I	40	1	80	1.5	60	34	2,040
HUD-51971-II	40	1	80	1.5	60	34	2,040
HUD-52396	96	1	96	2	192	34	6,528
HUD-52427	88	1	88	0.5	44	34	1,496
HUD-52482	40	1	40	2	80	34	2,720
HUD-52483-A	40	1	40	2	80	34	2,720
HUD-52484	532	4	2,128	10	21,280	34	723,520
HUD-52485	40	1	40	1	40	34	1,360
HUD-52651-A	40	1	40	2.5	100	34	3,400
HUD-52829	25	1	25	40	1,000	56	56,000
HUD-52830	25	1	25	16	400	56	22,400
HUD-52833	2,771	1	2,771	13	36,023	34	1,224,782
HUD-52836	10	1	10	0.5	5	56	280
HUD-52845	25	1	25	8	200	56	11,200
HUD-52846	25	1	25	16	400	56	22,400
HUD-52847	25	1	25	8	200	56	11,200
HUD-52849	25	1	25	1	25	56	1,400
HUD-53001	2,771	1	2,771	2.5	6,927	34	235,535
HUD-53015	40	1	40	3	120	34	4,080
HUD-5370	1,347	1	1,347	1	1,347	34	45,798
HUD-5370EZ	1,347	1	1,347	1	1,347	34	45,798
HUD-5370C1	1,347	1	1,347	1	1,347	34	45,798
HUD-5370C2	1,347	1	1,347	1	1,347	34	45,798
HUD-5372	590	1	590	1	590	34	20,060
HUD-5378	158	24	3,792	0.25	948	34	32,232
HUD-5460	40	1	40	1	40	34	1,360
Public Housing Information Center Certification of Accuracy ...	2,771	1	2,771	2	5,542	34	188,428
HUD-52828 Physical Needs Assessment form	2,771	1	2,771	15	41,565	56	2,327,640
Broadband Feasibility determination	2,771	1	2,771	10	27,710	34	942,140
SF-424	2,771	1	2,771	0	0	0	0
Totals	281,570	10,539,914

B. Solicitation of Public Comment

This notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected parties concerning the collection of information described in Section A on the following:

(1) 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) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;

(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 collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

(5) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use

of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

HUD encourages interested parties to submit comments in response to these questions.

C. Authority

Section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35.

Colette Pollard,

*Department Reports Management Officer,
Office of Policy Development and Research,
Chief Data Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2023-24079 Filed 10-31-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-67-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

[245A2100DD/AAKC001030/
A0A501010.999900]

HEARTH Act Approval of Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin Amended Residential Leasing Ordinance

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) approved the Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin Amended Residential Leasing Ordinance under the Helping Expedite and Advance Responsible Tribal Homeownership Act of 2012 (HEARTH Act). With this approval, the Tribe is authorized to enter into residential leases without further BIA approval.

DATES: BIA issued the approval on October 26, 2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Carla Clark, Bureau of Indian Affairs,

Division of Real Estate Services, 1001 Indian School Road NW, Albuquerque, NM 87104, carla.clark@bia.gov, (702) 484–3233.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Summary of the HEARTH Act

The HEARTH Act makes a voluntary, alternative land leasing process available to Tribes, by amending the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act of 1955, 25 U.S.C. 415. The HEARTH Act authorizes Tribes to negotiate and enter into business leases of Tribal trust lands with a primary term of 25 years, and up to two renewal terms of 25 years each, without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary). The HEARTH Act also authorizes Tribes to enter into leases for residential, recreational, religious or educational purposes for a primary term of up to 75 years without the approval of the Secretary. Participating Tribes develop Tribal Leasing regulations, including an environmental review process, and then must obtain the Secretary's approval of those regulations prior to entering into leases. The HEARTH Act requires the Secretary to approve Tribal regulations if the Tribal regulations are consistent with the Department of the Interior's (Department) leasing regulations at 25 CFR part 162 and provide for an environmental review process that meets requirements set forth in the HEARTH Act. This notice announces that the Secretary, through the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, has approved the Tribal regulations for the Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin.

II. Federal Preemption of State and Local Taxes

The Department's regulations governing the surface leasing of trust and restricted Indian lands specify that, subject to applicable Federal law, permanent improvements on leased land, leasehold or possessory interests, and activities under the lease are not subject to State and local taxation and may be subject to taxation by the Indian Tribe with jurisdiction. *See* 25 CFR 162.017. As explained further in the preamble to the final regulations, the Federal Government has a strong interest in promoting economic development, self-determination, and Tribal sovereignty. 77 FR 72440, 72447–48 (December 5, 2012). The principles supporting the Federal preemption of State law in the field of Indian leasing and the taxation of lease-related interests and activities applies with equal force to leases entered into under Tribal leasing regulations approved by the Federal Government pursuant to the HEARTH Act. Section 5 of the Indian

Reorganization Act (IRA), 25 U.S.C. 5108, preempts State and local taxation of permanent improvements on trust land. *Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation v. Thurston County*, 724 F.3d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 2013) (citing *Mescalero Apache Tribe v. Jones*, 411 U.S. 145 (1973)). Similarly, section 5108 of the IRA preempts State taxation of rent payments by a lessee for leased trust lands, because “tax on the payment of rent is indistinguishable from an impermissible tax on the land.” *See Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Stranburg*, 799 F.3d 1324, 1331, n.8 (11th Cir. 2015). In addition, as explained in the preamble to the revised leasing regulations at 25 CFR part 162, Federal courts have applied a balancing test to determine whether State and local taxation of non-Indians on the reservation is preempted. *White Mountain Apache Tribe v. Bracker*, 448 U.S. 136, 143 (1980). The *Bracker* balancing test, which is conducted against a backdrop of “traditional notions of Indian self-government,” requires a particularized examination of the relevant State, Federal, and Tribal interests. We hereby adopt the *Bracker* analysis from the preamble to the surface leasing regulations, 77 FR at 72447–48, as supplemented by the analysis below.

The strong Federal and Tribal interests against State and local taxation of improvements, leaseholds, and activities on land leased under the Department's leasing regulations apply equally to improvements, leaseholds, and activities on land leased pursuant to Tribal leasing regulations approved under the HEARTH Act. Congress's overarching intent was to “allow Tribes to exercise greater control over their own land, support self-determination, and eliminate bureaucratic delays that stand in the way of homeownership and economic development in Tribal communities.” 158 Cong. Rec. H. 2682 (May 15, 2012). The HEARTH Act was intended to afford Tribes “flexibility to adapt lease terms to suit [their] business and cultural needs” and to “enable [Tribes] to approve leases quickly and efficiently.” H. Rep. 112–427 at 6 (2012).

Assessment of State and local taxes would obstruct these express Federal policies supporting Tribal economic development and self-determination, and also threaten substantial Tribal interests in effective Tribal Government, economic self-sufficiency, and territorial autonomy. *See Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Community*, 572 U.S. 782, 810 (2014) (Sotomayor, J., concurring) (determining that “[a] key goal of the Federal Government is to render Tribes

more self-sufficient, and better positioned to fund their own sovereign functions, rather than relying on Federal funding”). The additional costs of State and local taxation have a chilling effect on potential lessees, as well as on a Tribe that, as a result, might refrain from exercising its own sovereign right to impose a Tribal tax to support its infrastructure needs. *See id.* at 810–11 (finding that State and local taxes greatly discourage Tribes from raising tax revenue from the same sources because the imposition of double taxation would impede Tribal economic growth).

Similar to BIA's surface leasing regulations, Tribal regulations under the HEARTH Act pervasively cover all aspects of leasing. *See* 25 U.S.C. 415(h)(3)(B)(i) (requiring Tribal regulations be consistent with BIA surface leasing regulations). Furthermore, the Federal Government remains involved in the Tribal land leasing process by approving the Tribal leasing regulations in the first instance and providing technical assistance, upon request by a Tribe, for the development of an environmental review process. The Secretary also retains authority to take any necessary actions to remedy violations of a lease or of the Tribal regulations, including terminating the lease or rescinding approval of the Tribal regulations and reassuming lease approval responsibilities. Moreover, the Secretary continues to review, approve, and monitor individual Indian land leases and other types of leases not covered under the Tribal regulations according to 25 CFR part 162.

Accordingly, the Federal and Tribal interests weigh heavily in favor of preemption of State and local taxes on lease-related activities and interests, regardless of whether the lease is governed by Tribal leasing regulations or 25 CFR part 162. Improvements, activities, and leasehold or possessory interests may be subject to taxation by the Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin.

Bryan Newland,

Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2023–24089 Filed 10–31–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4337–15–P