(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Respondents will be employers in the public, private, and not-for-profit sectors, who volunteer to participate in the pilot. These employers will submit responses to the New ICE Form. Up to twice a year, ICE may request feedback data (*e.g.,* number of new hires, number of employees who requested to have a physical inspection, challenges associated with the Pilot procedure) from participating employers. A subset of the employers may take undertake fraudulent document training. Finally, employers participating in the Pilot must retain records as stipulated by the terms of the Pilot.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:*

Collection type	Number of respondents	Number of annual responses per respondent	Number of annual responses	Time per response (hours)	Average annual hours
Questionnaire	100,000	0.333	33,333	0.5	16,667
Feedback Data	100,000	2	200,000	0.5	100,000
Training	50,000	1	50,000	2	100,000
Document Retention	100,000	10	1,000,000	0.083	83,333
Average Annual Hours					300,000

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total estimated annual hour burden associated with this collection is 300,000 hours.

(7) *An estimate of the total public burden (in cost) associated with the collections:* There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection of information. The information for this collection may be submitted and retained electronically.

Sharon Hageman,

Deputy Assistant Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs and Policy, U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. 2023–16589 Filed 8–2–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–28–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

[234A2100DD/AAKC001030/ A0A501010.999900]

HEARTH Act Approval of Cocopah Tribe of Arizona Business Site Leasing Ordinance

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) approved the Cocopah Tribe of Arizona's 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 business leases without further BIA approval.

DATES: BIA issued the approval on July 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 Cocopah Tribe of Arizona.

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, 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 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 the part 162 regulations.

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 part 162. Improvements, activities, and leasehold or possessory interests may be subject to taxation by the Cocopah Tribe of Arizona.

Bryan Newland,

Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2023–16498 Filed 8–2–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4337–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[BLM_AK_FRN_MOU4500171910; AA–10725, AA–10982, AA–11024, AA–11025, AA–11141, AA–12593, AA–12619, AA–12621]

Alaska Native Claims Selection

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of decision approving lands for conveyance.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) hereby provides constructive notice that it will issue an appealable decision approving conveyance of the surface and subsurface estates in certain lands to Chugach Alaska Corporation, an Alaska Native regional corporation, pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (ANCSA), as amended.

DATES: Any party claiming a property interest in the lands affected by the decision may appeal the decision in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4 within the time limits set out in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

ADDRESSES: You may obtain a copy of the decision from the Bureau of Land Management, Alaska State Office, 222 West Seventh Avenue, #13, Anchorage, AK 99513–7504.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Abby Muth, Land Law Examiner, BLM Alaska State Office, 907–271–3345 or *amuth@blm.gov.* Individuals in the United States who are deaf, deafblind, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability may dial 711 (TTY, TDD, or TeleBraille) to access telecommunications relay services. Individuals outside the United States should use the relay services offered within their country to make international calls to the point of contact in the United States.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As required by 43 CFR 2650.7(d), notice is hereby given that the BLM will issue an appealable decision to Chugach Alaska Corporation. The decision approves conveyance of the surface and subsurface estates in certain lands pursuant to ANCSA (43 U.S.C. 1601, *et seq.*), as amended.

The lands are located within the Chugach National Forest, in the following townships, and aggregate 140.57 acres: T. 16 S., R. 6 W., Copper River Meridian; T. 2 N., R. 6 E., Seward Meridian (SM); T. 10 N., R. 7 E., SM; T. 11 N., R. 7 E., SM; T. 2 N., R. 9 E., SM; T. 7 N., R. 9 E., SM; T. 5 N., R. 10 E., SM; T. 9 N., R. 10 E., SM; T. 9 N., R. 11 E., SM. The decision addresses public access easements, if any, to be reserved to the United States pursuant to Sec. 17(b) of ANCSA (43 U.S.C. 1616(b)), in the lands approved for conveyance.

The BLM will also publish notice of the decision once a week for four consecutive weeks in ''The Anchorage Daily News'' newspaper.

Any party claiming a property interest in the lands affected by the decision may appeal the decision in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4 within the following time limits:

1. Unknown parties, parties unable to be located after reasonable efforts have been expended to locate, parties who fail or refuse to sign their return receipt, and parties who receive a copy of the decision by regular mail which is not certified, return receipt requested, shall have until September 5, 2023 to file an appeal.

2. Parties receiving service of the decision by certified mail shall have 30 days from the date of receipt to file an appeal.

Parties who do not file an appeal in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4 shall be deemed to have