

small number of individuals potentially impacted in this manner, no impacts on annual rates of recruitment or survival are likely to result.

Separately, as described previously, the increase in Level A harassment take corresponds to a commensurate decrease in the predicted number of Level B harassment and the total number of takes remains unchanged. Therefore, we re-affirm that small numbers of harbor seals will be taken relative to the population size of the Hood Canal stock of harbor seal.

In conclusion, there is no new information suggesting that our effects analysis or negligible impact finding for harbor seals should change.

Based on the information contained here and in the referenced documents, NMFS has reaffirmed the following: (1) The required mitigation measures will effect the least practicable impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat; (2) the proposed authorized takes will have a negligible impact on the affected marine mammal species or stocks; (3) the proposed authorized takes represent small numbers of marine mammals relative to the affected stock abundances; and (4) the Navy's activities will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on taking for subsistence purposes as no relevant subsistence uses of marine mammals are implicated by this action, and (5) appropriate monitoring and reporting requirements are included.

Endangered Species Act (ESA)

No incidental take of ESA-listed species is authorized or expected to result from this activity. Therefore, NMFS has determined that formal consultation under section 7 of the ESA is not required for this action.

National Environmental Policy Act

To comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*) and NOAA Administrative Order (NAO) 216-6A, NMFS must review our proposed action (*i.e.*, the modification of an IHA) with respect to potential impacts on the human environment.

This action is consistent with categories of activities identified in Categorical Exclusion B4 (IHAs with no anticipated serious injury or mortality) of the Companion Manual for NOAA Administrative Order 216-6A, which do not individually or cumulatively have the potential for significant impacts on the quality of the human environment and for which we have not identified any extraordinary circumstances that would preclude this categorical exclusion. Accordingly, NMFS has

determined that the issuance of the modified IHA qualifies to be categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

Authorization

NMFS has issued a modified IHA to the for in-water construction associated with the SPE project on Naval Base Kitsap Bangor, Washington effective until July 15, 2021. The only change is an increase in the authorized take of harbor seal take by Level A harassment from 125 to 509.

Dated: December 21, 2020.

Donna S. Wieting,

Director, Office of Protected Resources,
National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2020-28850 Filed 12-29-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Patent Examiner Employment Application

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, on or after the date of publication of this notice. The USPTO invites comment on this information collection renewal, which helps the USPTO assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. Public comments were previously requested via the **Federal Register** on October 23, 2020 during a 60-day comment period. This notice allows for an additional 30 days for public comments.

Agency: United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce.

Title: Patent Examiner Employment Application.

OMB Control Number: 0651-0042.

Forms: None.

Type of Request: Extension and revision of a currently approved information collection.

Number of Respondents: 8,386 respondents per year.

Average Hours per Response: The USPTO estimates that it will take the public approximately 30 minutes (0.5 hours) to complete the patent examiner

application questions. This includes the time to gather the necessary information, respond to the system prompts, and submit the completed request to the USPTO.

Estimated Total Annual Respondent Burden Hours: 4,193 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Non-Hour Cost Burden: \$0.

Needs and Uses: USPTO uses the Monster Hiring Management (MHM) system to rapidly review applications for employment of entry-level patent examiners. The use of such automated online systems during recruitment allows USPTO to remain competitive, meet hiring goals, and fulfill the Agency's Congressional commitment to reduce the pendency rate for the examination of patent applications. Given the time sensitive hiring needs of the Patent Examining Corps, the MHM system provides increased speed and accuracy during the employment process.

This information collection covers respondent data gathered through the MHM system. The MHM online application collects supplemental information to a candidate's USAJOBS application. This information assists USPTO Human Resource Specialists and Hiring Managers in determining whether an applicant possesses the basic qualification requirements for a patent examiner position. From the information collected, the MHM system creates an electronic real-time candidate inventory on applicants' expertise and technical knowledge, which allows USPTO to immediately review applications from multiple applicants.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.

This information collection request may be viewed at www.reginfo.gov. Follow the instructions to view Department of Commerce, USPTO information collections currently under review by OMB.

Written comments and recommendations for this information collection should be submitted within 30 days of the publication of this notice on the following website www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. Find this particular information collection by selecting "Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments" or by using the search function and entering either the title of the information collection or the OMB Control Number 0651-0042.

Further information can be obtained by:

• *Email: InformationCollection@uspto.gov.* Include “0651–0042 information request” in the subject line of the message.

• *Mail: Kimberly Hardy, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450.*

Kimberly Hardy,

Information Collections Officer, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

[FR Doc. 2020–28869 Filed 12–29–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–16–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket ID ED–2020–OPEPD–0096]

Administrative Priority and Definitions for Discretionary Grant Programs

AGENCY: Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Department of Education.

ACTION: Final priority and definitions.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Education announces a priority and definitions for discretionary grant programs that the Secretary may use in fiscal year (FY) 2021 and later years to promote the use of the Department of Education’s (the Department’s) discretionary grants funds to support remote learning.

DATES: The priority and definitions are effective January 29, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kelly Terpak, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 4W312, Washington, DC 20202. Telephone: (202) 205–5231. Email: kelly.terpak@ed.gov.

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll-free, at 1–800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e–3.

We published a notice of proposed priority and definitions (NPP) in the **Federal Register** on September 8, 2020 (85 FR 55439). That notice contained background information and our reasons for proposing the particular administrative priority and definitions.

We have made minor revisions to paragraphs (b) and (f) of the priority and to the definition of “interoperable credentials,” which we explain in the *Analysis of Comments and Changes* section of this document.

Public Comment: In response to our invitation in the NPP, 16 parties submitted comments.

We group major issues according to subject. Generally, we do not address technical and other minor changes. In addition, we do not address general comments that raised concerns not directly related to the proposed priority and definitions.

Analysis of the Comments and Changes: An analysis of the comments and of any changes in the priority and definitions since publication of the NPP follows.

Comments: A few commenters asked for clarity on how the priority would be used and encouraged the Department to prioritize certain applicants, such as institutions of higher education, for eligibility.

Discussion: As discussed in the NPP, the priority is intended to build State and local capacity to support remote learning and instruction. The Department may elect to use this priority when inviting applications for a discretionary grant program. The Department has the discretion to choose whether the priority and definitions are appropriate for the competition after considering program purpose, feasibility, and scope. The Department also has the discretion to choose how the priority would apply; for example, the priority may be used as an absolute priority (applicants must address the priority in order to be eligible to receive grant funds) or a competitive preference priority (applicants may receive additional points depending on how well they address the priority). We will only use the priority and definitions for a particular grant competition when it is relevant and appropriate. Furthermore, the Department is not required to use the priority and definitions for any particular program.

In any competition in which this priority and definitions are used, eligible entities are determined by the program statute; therefore, we cannot specify eligibility for a particular type of entity as part of the final priority.

Changes: None.

Comments: A few commenters proposed revisions to, or additional language for, the background section that accompanied the proposed priority to emphasize the impact of school closures for in-person instruction on different populations, such as students with disabilities, as well as specifics related to learning losses discussed in the cited study.

Discussion: We appreciate the feedback we received on the NPP background section, which explains our rationale for this priority and definitions. We agree with comments that emphasized the impact of school closures for in-person instruction on

students with disabilities and other groups of students and believe the commenters’ concerns are sufficiently addressed through paragraph (f) of the priority. Moreover, we are revising paragraph (f) so that a program may choose to focus on a specific subgroup. Additionally, we added language in parentheses clarifying that where the commonly used terms used for the subgroups of students in paragraph (f) or similar terms are defined in the applicable authorizing program statute, these terms take on the statutory definition that applies to the particular program. For example, this priority could be used in the Alaska Native Education (ANE) program to encourage projects that provide high-quality remote learning to students who are Alaska Natives, as defined in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA), through the use of paragraph (f)(iv) of the priority, pertaining to Native American students.

Changes: We are modifying paragraph (f) so that a program may choose to focus on specific subgroups and have clarified that the definitions of listed subgroups may be based on the program’s statutory authority, as applicable.

Comments: Multiple commenters requested that we reference Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act in the accessibility requirement paragraph that concludes the priority.

Discussion: We agree that accessibility is important in ensuring all students can access remote learning effectively, and we have indicated so in various paragraphs of the priority. Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act applies only to Federal agencies, so recipients of Federal financial assistance are not required to comply with that law; consequently, inclusion of Section 508 in the accessibility requirement has limited applicability and is therefore unnecessary.

Changes: None.

Comments: Multiple commenters expressed concerns about the impact of remote learning for students with disabilities, including a concern that the priority did not take into account the individual needs of students identified for services pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

In addition, multiple commenters expressed support for paragraph (f) of the priority to target the needs of specific subgroups, including students with disabilities. However, one commenter recommended the Department remove the requirement that paragraph (f) of the priority be used only in conjunction with another paragraph of the priority.