

communities would automatically participate in CRS by virtue of participating in the NFIP.

(3) Would there be any advantage if FEMA were to assess an escalating surcharge on NFIP policy premiums for NFIP participating communities that are not in compliance with the NFIP minimum floodplain management standards? This would be in addition to the NFIP Probation policy surcharge that is in 44 CFR 59.24(b).

(4) What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of providing technical assistance to communities to support CRS participation? Would communities take advantage of technical assistance and if so, what type(s) of technical assistance would be most helpful? Examples of suggested technical assistance include assisting communities with the preparation of required CRS documents, CRS project management, CRS program support, and preparation of repetitive loss analysis.

(5) FEMA currently offers premium discounts for many CRS activities through the NFIP's current pricing approach. In CRS participating communities, this may lead to policyholders receiving "double" discounts for the same CRS activities (e.g., elevation of individual structure above the NFIP's minimum elevation requirement resulting in a structure level discount through the NFIP's current pricing approach and a CRS credit for a community-wide higher structure elevation regulation).

(a) If FEMA were to provide NFIP premium discounts to individual policyholders for CRS activities, through the NFIP's current pricing approach, should FEMA offer duplicate CRS discounts for the same activities that are already reflected in individual premiums? Why or why not?

(b) Assuming no to (a), would communities be incentivized to adopt measures in excess of FEMA's minimum floodplain management standards for community-wide activities that reduce future flood risk (e.g., stormwater management regulations or enhanced future land use planning) if FEMA were to only offer CRS discounts for those community-wide activities that reduce future flood risk?

(6) Are there additional community-level activities that are not currently included in the CRS program that measurably reduce flood risk to property? Please describe and, if available, provide national-level data that demonstrate how the activities measurably reduce current and/or future flood risk reduction to property.

(7) Would a participating CRS community be willing to exchange CRS

insurance policyholder premium discounts (e.g., all, some, or none) in a community for other comparable community-level benefits, such as enhanced technical assistance for the local CRS program or capacity-building grants? For example, if the aggregate amount of CRS discounts offered to individuals in the community totals \$100,000, would the community be interested in redistributing the total individual CRS discounts (e.g., \$100,000) among the community and the individual policyholders (e.g., \$50,000 to the community for enhanced technical assistance grants and \$50,000 to be distributed to individual policyholders in the form of CRS discounts)? By redistributing the CRS insurance policyholder premium discount benefits from the policyholders to the community, there would be a potential for both wider risk reduction and larger financial benefit to the community. Would such an approach make non-participating CRS communities more inclined to join the CRS program?

(8) Besides individual flood insurance financial premium discounts, what other benefits would best incentivize communities to maintain participation in or to join the CRS program?

(9) The current CRS program credits 19 activities and 90+ elements recognized by the CRS program and identified in the *CRS Coordinator's Manual* along with the credit points assigned to each activity. An activity is a floodplain management activity for which CRS credit has been established (e.g., mapping and regulations—higher regulatory standards). Elements are discrete parts of an activity that if implemented result in CRS credit points under that activity (e.g., community-wide prohibition of outdoor storage in the SFHA, which is an element of the activity of higher regulatory standards). What are some advantages and/or disadvantages of reducing the number of activities and elements, and streamlining CRS reporting requirements?

(10) What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of communities working with other communities to implement CRS under a regional approach? For example, a regional approach may include a regional watershed or planning commission that implements a CRS program for multiple communities or a shared CRS coordinator position among several communities.

(11) What else should FEMA consider for potential improvements to the CRS program and how can FEMA better engage with stakeholders to effectively implement the CRS program?

FEMA notes that this notice is issued solely for information and program-planning purposes. The suggested approaches do not reflect an agency position or official action. Responses to this notice do not bind FEMA to any further actions related to the response.

**Deanne Criswell,**

*Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.*

[FR Doc. 2024-15271 Filed 7-10-24; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9111-47-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[OMB Control Number 1615-0099]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities; Revision of a Currently Approved Collection: Application for T Nonimmigrant Status, Application for Derivative T Nonimmigrant Status, and Declaration for Trafficking Victim

**AGENCY:** U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

**ACTION:** 30-Day notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Homeland Security (DHS), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) will be submitting 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. The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments.

**DATES:** Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until August 12, 2024.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, must be submitted via the Federal eRulemaking Portal website at <http://www.regulations.gov> under e-Docket ID number USCIS-2006-0059. All submissions received must include the OMB Control Number 1615-0099 in the body of the letter, the agency name and Docket ID USCIS-2006-0059.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** USCIS, Office of Policy and Strategy, Regulatory Coordination Division, Samantha Deshommes, Chief, Telephone number (240) 721-3000 (This is not a toll-free number; comments are not accepted via telephone message.). Please note contact information provided here is solely for



questions regarding this notice. It is not for individual case status inquiries. Applicants seeking information about the status of their individual cases can check Case Status Online, available at the USCIS website at <http://www.uscis.gov>, or call the USCIS Contact Center at (800) 375-5283; TTY (800) 767-1833.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Comments

DHS previously published an information collection notice for within the Classification for Victims of Severe Forms of Trafficking in Persons; Eligibility for "T" Nonimmigrant Status (RIN 1615-AA59) final rule in the **Federal Register** on April 30, 2024, at 89 FR 34864, allowing for a 60-day public comment period. USCIS did receive 3 comments in connection with the 60-day notice.

You may access the information collection instrument with instructions, or additional information by visiting the Federal eRulemaking Portal site at <http://www.regulations.gov> and enter USCIS-2011-0010 in the search box. Comments must be submitted in English, or an English translation must be provided. The comments submitted to USCIS via this method are visible to the Office of Management and Budget and comply with the requirements of 5 CFR 1320.12(c). All submissions will be posted, without change, to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>, and will include any personal information you provide. Therefore, submitting this information makes it public. You may wish to consider limiting the amount of personal information that you provide in any voluntary submission you make to DHS. DHS may withhold information provided in comments from public viewing that it determines may impact the privacy of an individual or is offensive. For additional information, please read the Privacy Act notice that is available via the link in the footer of <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate 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) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

##### Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Revision of a Currently Approved Collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Application for T Nonimmigrant Status, Application for Derivative T Nonimmigrant Status, and Declaration for Trafficking Victim.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the DHS sponsoring the collection:* Form I-914; USCIS.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* *Primary:* Individuals or households. Form I-914 permits victims of a severe form of trafficking in persons and certain eligible family members to demonstrate that they qualify for temporary nonimmigrant status pursuant to the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, and to receive temporary immigration benefits.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* Form I-914, 1,310 responses at 2.63 hours per response; Form I-914, Supplement A, 1,120 responses at 1.083 hours per response; Form I-914, Supplement B (section that officer completes), 459 responses at 3.58 hours per response; Form I-914, Supplement B (section that respondent completes), 459 responses at .25 hours per response. Biometric processing 2,430 respondents requiring Biometric Processing at an estimated 1.17 hours per response.

(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 9,261 hours.

(7) *An estimate of the total public burden (in cost) associated with the collection:* The estimated total annual cost burden associated with this collection of information is \$2,532,300.

Dated: July 8, 2024.

**Samantha L. Deshommès,**  
Chief, Regulatory Coordination Division,  
Office of Policy and Strategy, U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration Services, Department of  
Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. 2024-15273 Filed 7-10-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111-97-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

[NPS-WASO-NAGPRA-NPS0038220;  
PPWOCRADNO-PCU00RP14.R50000]

#### Notice of Intended Repatriation: Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, MN

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the Minnesota Historical Society intends to repatriate a certain cultural item that meets the definition of an unassociated funerary object and sacred object and that has a cultural affiliation with the Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations in this notice.

**DATES:** Repatriation of the cultural item in this notice may occur on or after August 12, 2024.

**ADDRESSES:** Cecily Marcus, Minnesota Historical Society, 345 West Kellogg Boulevard, Saint Paul, MN 55102, telephone (651) 259-3123, email [cecily.marcus@mnhs.org](mailto:cecily.marcus@mnhs.org).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA. The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the Minnesota Historical Society, and additional information on the determinations in this notice, including the results of consultation, can be found in the summary or related records. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

#### Abstract of Information Available

A total of one cultural item has been requested for repatriation. The one item, determined by MNHS and Native American consultants to be both an Unassociated Funerary Object and a Sacred Object, is the noose used to execute Wicanhpi Wastedanpi (Good Little Stars, or, Chaske), also known as the "Mankato Hanging Rope" (MNHS #3333.H474). Wicanhpi Wastedanpi was one of the 38 Dakota men hanged on December 26, 1862 in Mankato, MN.