

intervention, or may use grant administrative data for evaluation. Finally, FEMA would also be interested in learning of ongoing or current studies that are in process, for which study findings will not be available at the time that comments in response to this notice are due, such as research question being addressed, sample size, study timeline, and registry where the study findings will be made available.

This information will assist FEMA understand existing empirical and other evidence, methods being utilized, available data, and research gaps to prioritize future evaluation funding. This will also help FEMA understand if this is an area where limited research and evaluation is available.

### III. List of Questions for Commenters

FEMA seeks information on the following: (1) Existing evidence regarding HSGP effectiveness, and (2) Evidence from other programs or research areas that FEMA can rely upon to expand or revise the HSGP research agenda, such as by changing how FEMA and HSGP grantees and subgrantees measure outputs/outcomes, assess capacity/capability, and use grants administrative data for evaluation.

Priority Research Questions for FEMA on HSGP include:

1. What studies and evidence exist on assessing HSGP outcomes? What are the study, findings, sample, and methods employed? Is there a URL(s) publicly available with the study report and information?

2. What meta-analysis and/or summaries of evidence exist on the HSGP program?

Supporting questions specific to HSGP:

3. What outputs and outcomes are HSGP grants achieving?

4. How well does HSGP funding help build and sustain core capabilities? (<https://www.fema.gov/core-capability-development-sheets>)

5. How does HSGP funding affect identified capability gaps?

6. Which HSGP funding activities most effectively close capability gaps?

7. How do participants' KSAs (knowledge, skills, and abilities) change after completing an HSGP-funded training, after creating or enhancing an HSGP-funded plan, and/or after completing an HSGP-funded exercise?

8. How does HSGP funding influence grant recipient preparedness?

9. How well do HSGP investments contribute to preparedness for and response to real world incidents?

10. How well have HSGP projects reduced the risk of real-world incidents?

### Broader Research Questions

#### Outputs/Outcomes/Benefits/Success metrics:

11. FEMA is interested in performance management and program evaluations conducted by HSGP award recipients, beyond what is reported to FEMA. What additional output and outcome measurements have been determined as crucial to determining program results and are beyond FEMA reporting requirements? What were the results of evaluations, if conducted?

12. What are the best output and outcome metrics to measure prevention of either a human-caused or natural incident (e.g., terrorism, cyber-attack, hurricane)?

13. What are the best output and outcome metrics to measure the reduction of risk posed by terrorism or other incidents?

14. What is the best way to measure the quality of a planning document and to measure the improvement in outputs and outcomes resulting from the planning document's creation?

15. What is the best way to use exercises to measure change or improvement through exercises?

#### Capacity/Capability Assessments:

16. Are there specific interventions that would more properly be the subject of HSGP funding? What is the best way to measure improvements in grant recipient capabilities due to grant funding?

17. With respect to specific interventions that might properly be the subject of HSGP funding, if measuring change through self-reported assessments, what is a feasible expectation for magnitude of improvement within a specified timeframe?

18. Please provide examples of instruments provided to grant recipients for self-assessments and which result in information that is useful for both grant recipients and funders. Of particular interest are instruments that can be implemented by users with a wide range of evaluation or measurement experience (i.e., none to expert).

#### Grant Administration & Evaluation:

19. Have formula or block grants (grants not competitively awarded) been successfully evaluated for effectiveness? What was the study design and sample, and what were the findings?

20. How do Federal agencies use administrative data to understand grant effectiveness in instances when grant implementation is at the state and local level?

#### Evidence on Program Impacts and Grant Effectiveness

21. Have impact evaluations been conducted that look at the difference

between a control or comparison group and the treatment group? What are the study research question(s), design, sample, and findings? Where can more information on the study be found?

#### Dissemination of Results:

FEMA staff developed the RFI questions and will analyze the responses. We expect the analysis period to deepen our vision and understanding of the relationships between homeland security grants and overall preparedness.

*Rights to Materials Submitted:* By submitting material in response to this RFI, the respondent is agreeing to grant DHS a worldwide, royalty-free, perpetual, irrevocable, non-exclusive license to use the material and to make it publicly available. Further, the respondent agrees that it owns, has a valid license, or is otherwise authorized to provide the material to DHS.

This RFI is issued for information and planning purposes only and does not constitute an offer by the Federal Government to fund, as a whole or in part, the opportunities referenced herein. This RFI does not represent a pre-solicitation synopsis or a solicitation and does not constitute a request for proposal or request for quote.

The Federal Government will not pay for any information or administrative costs incurred in responding to this RFI; all costs associated with responding to this RFI will be solely at the interested party's expense. Any response received will not be used as a proposal or quote. The responses to this RFI will be reviewed by the Federal Government and may be used to develop requirements for future needs.

**Pete Gaynor,**

*Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.*

[FR Doc. 2020-12620 Filed 6-10-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9111-46-P**

## INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

### Request for Nominations to the Board of Trustees

**AGENCY:** Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development (aka Institute of American Indian Arts).

**ACTION:** Notice; request for nominations.

**SUMMARY:** The Board directs the Administration of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, including soliciting, accepting, and

disposing of gifts, bequests, and other properties for the benefit of the Institute. The Institute provides scholarly study of and instruction in Indian art and culture and establishes programs which culminate in the awarding of degrees in the various fields of Indian art and culture. The Board consists of thirteen members appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the consent of the U.S. Senate, who are American Indians or persons knowledgeable in the field of Indian art and culture. This notice requests nominations to fill one expiring term on the Board of Trustees.

**ADDRESSES:** Institute of American Indian Arts, 83 Avan Nu Po Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87508.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Robert Martin, President, 505-424-2301.

Dated: June 5, 2020.

**Robert Martin,**  
President.

[FR Doc. 2020-12667 Filed 6-10-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-W4-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

[Docket No. FWS-R8-ES-2020-0021;  
FF08ESMF00-FXES11140800000-189]

#### Stanislaus Regional Water Authority Water Supply Project, Stanislaus County, California; Draft Categorical Exclusion and Draft Habitat Conservation Plan

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of permit application; request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce the availability of a draft categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act. We also announce receipt of an application for an incidental take permit under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), and receipt of a draft habitat conservation plan. The Stanislaus Regional Water Authority (SRWA) has applied for an incidental take permit under the ESA for the SRWA Water Supply Project in Stanislaus County, California. The permit would authorize the take of one species incidental to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. We invite the public and local, State, Tribal, and Federal agencies to comment on this application. Before issuing the requested permit, we will take into consideration any information

that we receive during the public comment period.

**DATES:** We must receive your written comments on or before July 13, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:**

*Obtaining Documents:* The draft categorical exclusion (draft CatEx), draft habitat conservation plan (HCP), and any comments and other materials that we receive are available for public inspection at <http://www.regulations.gov> in Docket No. FWS-R8-ES-2020-0021.

*Submitting Comments:* To send written comments, please use one of the following methods, and note that your information requests or comments are in reference to the draft CatEx, draft HCP, or both.

- *Internet:* Submit comments at <http://www.regulations.gov> under Docket No. FWS-R8-ES-2020-0021.

- *U.S. Mail:* Public Comments Processing, Attn: Docket No. FWS-R8-ES-2020-0021; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Headquarters, MS: PRB/3W; 5275 Leesburg Pike; Falls Church, VA 22041-3803.

For more information, see Public Comments under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Timothy Ludwick, Senior Wildlife Biologist, or Patricia Cole, Chief, San Joaquin Valley Division, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, by phone at 916-414-6600 or via the Federal Relay Service at 800-877-8339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of a draft categorical exclusion (CatEx), prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA; 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), and its implementing regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 40 CFR 1506.6. This notice also announces the receipt of an application from the Stanislaus Regional Water Authority (SRWA; applicant), for a 10-year incidental take permit (ITP) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). Application for the permit requires the preparation of an HCP with measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the impacts of incidental take to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant prepared the draft SRWA Water Supply Project Low Effect Habitat Conservation Plan (draft HCP) pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA. The purpose of the CatEx is to assess the effects of issuing the permit and implementing the draft HCP on the natural and human environment.

## Background Information

Section 9 of the ESA (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544 *et seq.*) prohibits the taking of fish and wildlife species listed as endangered under section 4 of the ESA; by regulation, this take prohibition also applies to certain species listed as threatened, including the Valley elderberry longhorn beetle. 50 CFR 17.31(a). Regulations governing permits for endangered and threatened species are at 50 CFR 17.22 and 17.32. For more about the Federal habitat conservation plan (HCP) program, go to <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/hcp.pdf>.

## National Environmental Policy Act Compliance

The proposed permit issuance triggers the need for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA; 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*). The draft CatEx was prepared to analyze the impacts of issuing an ITP based on the draft HCP and to inform the public of the proposed action, any alternatives, and associated impacts, and to disclose any irreversible commitments of resources.

### Proposed Action Alternative

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the Service would issue an ITP to the applicant for a period of 10 years for certain covered activities (described below). The applicant has requested an ITP for one covered species (described below), which is listed as threatened under the ESA.

### Habitat Conservation Plan Area

The geographic scope of the draft HCP encompasses 16 acres, including the entire footprint needed to complete the project. The project would result in the installation of 3,900 feet of pipeline in the unincorporated portion of central Stanislaus County, California.

### Covered Activities

The proposed section 10 ITP would allow take of one covered species from covered activities in the proposed HCP area. The applicant is requesting incidental take authorization for covered activities, including site preparation, construction, and access road maintenance in the project area. The applicant is proposing to implement a number of project design features, including best management practices, as well as general and species-specific avoidance and minimization measures to minimize the impacts of the take from the covered activities.