SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Supporting documents which explain in detail the information that EPA will be collecting are available in the public docket for this ICR. The docket can be viewed online at www.regulations.gov or in person at EPA Docket Center, WJC West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The telephone number for the Docket Center is 202–566–1744. For additional information about EPA’s public docket, visit http://www.epa.gov/dockets.

Abstract: EPA is requesting renewed approval to offer voluntary participation in the Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program (PESP). The program uses the information collected to establish partner membership, develop stewardship strategies, measure progress towards stewardship goals, and award incentives. PESP is an EPA partnership program that encourages the use of integrated pest management (IPM) strategies to reduce pests and pesticide risks. IPM is an approach that involves making the best choices from among a series of pest management practices that are both economical and pose the least possible hazard to people, property, and the environment.

While most PESP members are entities that are pesticide end-users, several others are organizations which focus on training, educating, or influencing pesticide users. To become a PESP member, a pesticide user entity or an organization submits an application and a five-year strategy. The strategy outlines how environmental and human health risk reduction goals will be achieved through IPM implementation or education. The program encourages PESP members to track progress towards IPM goals such as: Reductions in unnecessary use of pesticides, cost reductions, and knowledge shared about IPM methodologies. Entities participating in PESP also benefit from technical assistance, and through incentives for achievements at different levels.

PESP is EPA’s non-regulatory approach to meeting the goals of the Pollutant Prevention Act (PPA), the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), and the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) to reduce pesticide risks in agricultural and non-agricultural settings. Section 2(b) of the PPA of 1990, 42 U.S.C. 13101(b), sets forth “the national policy of the United States that pollution should be prevented or reduced at the source whenever feasible.” Section 3 defines source reduction as any practice that “reduces the amount of any hazardous substance . . . released into the environment” and “reduces the hazards to public health and the environment associated with the release of such substances.”

Section 3 of FIFRA requires EPA to regulate pesticides to prevent “unreasonable adverse effects” on human health and the environment. Further, FQPA of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 136r–1) requires the U.S. Department of Agriculture and EPA to implement programs in research, demonstration, and education to support the adoption of IPM, make information on IPM widely available to pesticide users, use IPM techniques in carrying out pest management activities, as well as promote IPM through procurement, regulatory policies and other activities.

Form Numbers: Strategy/Progress Reporting Form for PESP Members that are Not Commercial/Residential Pest Control Services (EPA Form No. 9600–01); PESP Membership Application Form (EPA Form 9600–02); and PESP Strategy/Progress Reporting Form for Residential/Commercial Pest Control Service Providers (EPA Form No. 9600–03).

Respondents/affected entities: Entities potentially affected by this ICR are pesticide user companies and organizations, or entities that practice IPM or promote the use of IPM through education and training.

Respondent’s obligation to respond: Voluntary, required to obtain or retain a benefit.

Estimated number of respondents: 419 (total).

Frequency of response: Annually and on occasion.

Total estimated burden: 47,665 hours (per year). Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.03(b).

Total estimated cost: $3,126,949 (per year), includes $0 annualized capital or operation & maintenance costs.

Changes in the estimates: There is an increase of 4,642 hours in the total estimated respondent burden compared with the ICR currently approved by OMB. This increase is an adjustment of EPA’s projection based on historical information about PESP membership.

Courtney Kerwin,
Director, Regulatory Support Division.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with regulations at 40 CFR part 53, the EPA evaluates various methods for monitoring the concentrations of those ambient air pollutants for which EPA has established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQSs) as set forth in 40 CFR part 50. Monitoring methods that are determined to meet specific requirements for adequacy are designated by the EPA as either reference or equivalent methods (as applicable), thereby permitting their use under 40 CFR part 58 by States and other agencies for determining compliance with the NAAQSs. A list of all reference or equivalent methods that have been previously designated by EPA may be found at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/amtic/criteria.html.

The EPA hereby announces the designation of one new equivalent method for measuring concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) in ambient air.
NumaView data monitoring interfaces; and the conditioner, external communication and associated instrument manual; and with or compensation ON, in accordance with the high efficiency photolytic converter, temperature in the range of 15°C to 35°C, operations in a manner that is consistent with the guidance and recommendations of applicable general accordance with the guidance methods to guide their lending policies should address certain lending and appropriate to their size and nature limits, loan administration policies, portfolio diversification standards, and

Institutions use real estate lending portfolio diversification standards, and

The FDIC, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the renewal of existing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35). Currently, the FDIC is soliciting comment on renewal of the information collections described below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 27, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties are invited to submit written comments to the FDIC by any of the following methods:

- Email: comments@fdic.gov. Include the name and number of the collection in the subject line of the message.
- Hand Delivery: Comments may be hand-delivered to the guard station at the rear of the 17th Street Building (located on F Street), on business days between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

All comments should refer to the relevant OMB control number. A copy of the comments may also be submitted to the OMB desk officer for the FDIC: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Jones, at the FDIC address above.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Proposal to renew the following currently approved collections of information:

1. Title: Real Estate Lending Standards.
   OMB Number: 3064–0112.
   Form Number: None.

Affected Public: Insured State Nonmember Banks and State Savings Associations.

Burden Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of burden</th>
<th>Estimated number of respondents</th>
<th>Estimated number of responses</th>
<th>Estimated time per response (hours)</th>
<th>Frequency of response</th>
<th>Total annual estimated burden (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Lending Standards ... Recordkeeping ......</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>On Occasion ......</td>
<td>77,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Description of Collection: Institutions use real estate lending policies to guide their lending operations in a manner that is consistent with safe and sound banking practices and appropriate to their size and nature and scope of their operations. These policies should address certain lending considerations, including loan-to-value limits, loan administration policies, and