management improvements as well as demolition and new construction. In addition, these funds can be used on a limited basis (and combined with other funding) for improvements to the surrounding community, public services, facilities, assets and supportive services. Choice Neighborhoods grant funds are intended to catalyze other investments that will be directed toward necessary community improvements. The leveraging of other sources will be necessary to address other key neighborhood assets and achieve the program’s core goals. HUD is working with other Federal agencies to integrate Choice Neighborhoods with other Federal place-based programs.

Agency Form Number: Pending.

Members of Affected Public: Local governments, public housing authorities, nonprofits, and for-project developers that apply jointly with a public entity.

Estimation of the total numbers of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of responses, and hours of responses: For Choice Neighborhoods burden hours per response total to 68.09 for Implementation Grant applications and 34.59 for Planning Grant applications. The total burden hours, estimating 150 respondents for both application is 6,864.

Status of the proposed information collection: This is a new information Collection.


Dated: March 15, 2011.

Merrie Nichols-Dixon, Deputy Director for Office of Policy, Programs and Legislative Initiatives.

[FR Doc. 2011–7674 Filed 3–22–11; 8:45 am]
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[Docket No. FR–5498–N–01]


AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (the Recovery Act) included a $4 billion appropriation of Capital Funds for public housing agencies (PHAs) to carry out capital and management activities, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (the 1937 Act). The Recovery Act required that $3 billion of these funds be distributed as formula funds and the remaining $1 billion be distributed through a competitive process. HUD obligated approximately $2.985 million in formula funds to PHAs on March 18, 2009. On May 7, 2009, HUD posted on its Web site its Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), which launched the competitive distribution of Capital Funds. In September 2009, HUD announced the award of $995 million in Capital Fund Recovery Competition (CFRC) Grants. In accordance with the Recovery Act, HUD was required to reallocate any Recovery Act Capital Funds that were returned prior to the initial obligation deadline and/or recaptured.

After award, a number of grantees were subsequently unable to meet the NOFA and Recovery Act criteria and approximately $14 million in CFRC funds were recaptured. Additionally, another $3.2 million in Capital Fund Recovery Grant (CFRG) funds that were unable to meet the obligation deadline were recaptured. Since the Act required that HUD redistribute any grant funds that were not in compliance, $17,161,649.00 was awarded to pending Recovery Act PHA applicants who had applied for funding under Category 4, Option 2 of the NOFA Creation of Energy Efficient, Green Communities, consistent with the Department’s objective of promoting energy efficiency. This notice announces the grantees that received the reallocated funds.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dominique G. Blum, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Housing Investments, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Room 4130, Washington, DC, 20410–400, telephone number 202–402–8500 (this is not a toll-free number). Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access this number through the TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Information Relay Service at 800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NOFA for HUD’s CFRC Grants program made available $995 million to PHAs for capital and management activities as authorized under section 9 of the 1937 Act in accordance with four funding categories: (1) Improvements addressing the needs of the elderly and/or persons with disabilities; (2) public housing transformation; (3) gap financing for projects that are stalled due to financing issues; and (4) creation of energy efficient, green communities.

In accordance with the Recovery Act (Pub. L. 111–5, approved February 17, 2009), PHAs had to give priority to capital projects that could award contracts based on bids within 120 days from the date the funds were made available to the PHAs and had to prioritize capital projects that were already underway or included in the 5-year Capital Fund plans required by the 1937 Act. Additionally, funds had to supplement and not supplant expenditures from other Federal, State, or local sources or funds independently generated by the grantee. Finally, the Recovery Act provided for alternate obligation and expenditure deadlines (and penalties) as follows:

(1) HUD must obligate the CFRC grant funding to grantees by September 30, 2009.

(2) PHAs must obligate 100 percent of the grant funds awarded under this NOFA within 1 year of the date on which funds become available to the PHA for obligation (which is the effective date of the Annual Contributions Contract (ACC) amendment). If a PHA fails to comply with the 1-year obligation requirement, the Recovery Act required HUD to recapture all remaining unobligated funds awarded to the PHA, and to reallocate the recaptured funds to PHAs that are in compliance with the Recovery Act’s obligation requirement.

(3) PHAs must expend at least 60 percent of the grant funds within 2 years of the date on which funds become available to the PHA for obligation (which is the effective date of the ACC amendment). If a PHA fails to comply with the 2-year expenditure requirement, the Recovery Act required HUD to recapture the balance of the funds awarded to the PHA, and to reallocate the recaptured funds to PHAs that are in compliance with the Recovery Act’s 2-year expenditure requirement.

(4) PHAs must expend 100 percent of the grant funds within 3 years of the date on which funds become available to the PHA for obligation (which is the effective date of the ACC amendment). If a PHA fails to comply with the 3-year expenditure requirement, the Recovery Act required HUD to recapture the balance of the funds awarded to the PHA, and to reallocate the recaptured funds to PHAs that are in compliance with the Recovery Act’s 3-year expenditure requirement.
Extensions of the obligation deadlines are not permitted under the Recovery Act.

Reallocation

After award, a number of grantees were subsequently unable to meet the Recovery Act and NOFA criteria and their funds were recaptured—$3.2 million in CFRG funds and approximately $14 million in CFRC funds. HUD was required to reallocate funds that were recaptured prior to July 21, 2010. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Pub. L. 111–2003, approved July 21, 2010) (Dodd-Frank Act) amended the Recovery Act to provide that Recovery Act funds recaptured on or after July 21, 2010, must be returned to the Treasury. (See section 1613 of the Dodd-Frank Act.) As a result, $17,161,649.00 was awarded to existing eligible Recovery Act PHA applicants who had applied for funding under Category 4, Option 2 of the NOFA Creation of Energy Efficient, Green Communities.

Table: PHA Name and Amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHA Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Housing Authority, Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>$2,189,470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City Housing Authority, New York, NY</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Pleasantville, Pleasantville, NJ</td>
<td>$621,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Marin Housing Authority, San Rafael, CA</td>
<td>$637,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Columbus, Columbus, GA</td>
<td>$1,344,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Columbus, Columbus, GA</td>
<td>$550,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Charleston, Charleston, SC</td>
<td>$1,990,528.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Housing Authority, Rockford, IL</td>
<td>$2,100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Monroe, Monroe, LA</td>
<td>$1,700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of St. Louis, St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>$2,635,149.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Nevada Regional Housing Agency, Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>$536,102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Marin Housing Authority, San Rafael, CA</td>
<td>$1,344,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Columbus, Columbus, GA</td>
<td>$550,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Charleston, Charleston, SC</td>
<td>$1,990,528.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Housing Authority, Rockford, IL</td>
<td>$2,100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Monroe, Monroe, LA</td>
<td>$1,700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of St. Louis, St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>$2,635,149.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Nevada Regional Housing Agency, Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>$536,102.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of Funded Applications: $17,161,649.00

Dated: March 11, 2011.

Sandra B. Henriquez, Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.

[FR Doc. 2011-6762 Filed 3-22-11; 8:45 am] BILING CODE 4210-67-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-R4-ES-2011-N007; 40120-1113-0000-C2]

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Notice of Availability of a Technical/Agency Draft Recovery Plan for Gentian Pinkroot

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability and request for public comment.

SUMMARY: We, the Fish and Wildlife Service, announce the availability of the technical/agency draft recovery plan for the endangered gentian pinkroot (Spigelia gentianoides). The draft recovery plan includes specific recovery objectives and criteria the species would have to meet in order for us to downlist it to threatened status under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). We request review and comment on this draft recovery plan from local, State, and Federal agencies, and the public.

DATES: In order to be considered, we must receive comments on the draft recovery plan on or before May 23, 2011.

ADDRESSES: If you wish to review this technical/agency draft recovery plan, you may obtain a copy by contacting Dr. Vivian Negron-Ortiz, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City Field Office, 1601 Balboa Ave, Panama City, FL 32405; tel. (850) 769–0552; or by visiting either the Service’s recovery plan Web site at http://endangered.fws.gov/recovery/index.html#plans or the Panama City Field Office Web site at http://www.fws.gov/panamacity/. If you wish to comment, you may submit your comments by one of the following methods:

1. You may submit written comments and materials to Dr. Negron-Ortiz, at the above address.

2. You may hand-deliver written comments to our Panama City Field Office, at the above address, or fax them to (850) 763–2177.

3. You may send comments by e-mail to vivian_negronortiz@fws.gov.

For additional information about submitting comments, see the “Request for Public Comments” section below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Negron-Ortiz at the above addresses or by telephone: (850) 769–0552, ext. 231. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Spigelia gentianoides was listed as endangered under the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) on November 26, 1990 (55 FR 49046). A plant, S. gentianoides, comprises two varieties: Var. gentianoides is restricted to five locations within three counties in the Florida Panhandle and southern Alabama, and var. alabamensis is a narrow endemic limited to the Bibb County Glades in Alabama. The loss or alteration of habitat is thought to be the primary reason for the species’ decline. The extant plants of var. gentianoides are located in fire-dependent longleaf pine–wiregrass and pine-oak-hickory ecosystems. Much of this habitat has been reduced in its range, converted to pine plantation, and managed without fire. Some of the glades in which var. alabamensis is located are owned and protected by The Nature Conservancy. This variety is threatened by potential development of privately owned glades (open, almost treeless areas within woodlands).

Restoring an endangered or threatened animal or plant to the point where it is again a secure, self-sustaining member of its ecosystem is a primary goal of our endangered species program. To help guide the recovery effort, we prepare recovery plans for most listed species. Recovery plans describe actions considered necessary for conservation of the species, establish criteria for downlisting or delisting, and