Overview of this information collection:

(1) Type of Information Collection: Revision of an existing collection.

(2) Title of the Form/Collection: Application for Temporary Protected Status.


(4) Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary: Individuals or Households. The information required on the Form I–821 is necessary in order for USCIS to make a determination that the applicant meets the TPS eligibility requirements and conditions.

(5) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: 335,333 responses at 1 hour and 30 minutes (1.5 hours) per response.

(6) An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection: 502,999 annual burden hours.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the information collection instrument, please visit the USCIS Web site at: http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.eb1d4c2a3e5b9ac89243c6a7543f0d1a/?vgnextoid=29227b58fa16e010VgnVCM1000000ecd190aRCRD&vgnext?vgnextoid=29227b58fa16e010VgnVCM1000000ecd190aRCRD.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the information collection instrument, please contact Richard A. Sloan, Chief, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Suite 3008, Washington, DC 20529; Telephone 202–272–8377.


Richard Sloan,
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insufficient funds verified to close and/or pay off debts; calculated borrowers’ total mortgage payments (including principal, interest, taxes and hazard insurance) using real estate taxes that were understated and, in some cases, also improperly omitted debts when assessing loan qualification; failed to comply with HUD/FHA requirements regarding qualification for streamline refinance transactions; approved loans with ratios exceeding HUD/FHA benchmark guidelines without compensating factors or without adequate compensating factors; allowed credit reports and/or income to asset verification forms and documentation to pass through the hands of third parties and, in certain cases, falsely certified that the documents were requested and received directly by BSM from the providers and/or that the documents received were true copies of the originals; allowed a non-purchasing spouse to take an ownership interest in a HUD/FHA-insured property; in violation of mortgage eligibility requirements; failed to ensure that property that was proposed or under construction was eligible for HUD/FHA mortgage insurance; closed loans in excess of the maximum allowable amount resulting in over-insured mortgages; failed to comply with Construction-Permanent Loan Program requirements; failed to ensure that the buyer, seller and/or settlement agent completed HUD–1 Addendum certifications; allowed one of its underwriters to also perform work for a manufactured housing seller; and used falsified documents and/or documents that contained unresolved discrepancies in the origination of HUD/FHA-insured mortgage loans.

4. Citrus State Mortgage, Incorporated, Mount Dora, FL [Docket No. 05–5079–MR]

Action: Settlement Agreement signed September 15, 2006. Without admitting liability or fault, Citrus State Mortgage, Incorporated (Citrus) and its President agreed to pay HUD an administrative payment in the amount of $35,000. Citrus also agreed not to reapply for reinstatement as an FHA-approved lender until March 1, 2008.

Cause: The Board took this action based on the following violations of HUD/FHA requirements in the origination of HUD/FHA-insured loans where Citrus: Paid prohibited referral fees to another entity controlled by one of the Citrus’s underwriters; paid its underwriters prohibited commission payments; charged prohibited document preparation fees to an entity owned and controlled by one of Citrus’s underwriters; and failed to develop and implement a Quality Control Plan and failed to perform a Quality Control review of two loans that went into default within the first six months.


Action: On October 18, 2005, the Board issued a letter to Colban Funding, Incorporated (Colban) withdrawing its HUD/FHA approval for three years. The Board also voted to impose a civil money penalty in the amount of $76,000.

Cause: The Board took this action based on the following violations of HUD/FHA requirements in the origination of HUD/FHA-insured loans where Colban: Violated HUD/FHA third party restrictions by allowing non HUD/FHA-approved mortgage brokers to participate in the origination of HUD/FHA-insured mortgages; falsely certified on forms HUD–92900–A, Addendum to the Uniform Residential Loan Application that the information contained in the Uniform Residential Loan Application and the Addendum was obtained directly from the borrower by a full-time employee of Colban or its duly authorized agent; failed to identify all of the HUD/FHA-approved lenders involved in the origination of HUD/FHA insured mortgage loans on HUD–92900–A and in HUD’s database system; failed to provide evidence that, where faxed documents were used, original verification documents were received and reviewed; failed to ensure that borrowers met the three percent minimum required cash investment; failed to provide adequate analysis or data verification of prior sales that occurred within one year of the appraisal report for three HUD/FHA-insured loans; failed to include and/or adequately evaluate borrower’s debt when underwriting loans; failed to adequately document the source and transfer of funds used for the downpayment and/or closing costs; failed to identify incorrect and inconsistent information on the HUD–1 Settlement Statement that affected conditions under which the loan was closed.

6. Colony Mortgage Corporation, Fairview Park, OH [Docket No. 05–5057–MR]

Action: Settlement Agreement signed August 22, 2006. Without admitting liability or fault, Colony Mortgage Corporation, (Colony) agreed to pay HUD an administrative payment in the amount of $258,000. Colony also agreed to indemnify HUD for any losses on two loans.

Cause: The Board took this action based on the following violations of HUD/FHA requirements in the origination of HUD/FHA-insured loans where Colony: Violated third party origination restrictions by sponsoring loans from an unapproved entity; caused a false certification on form HUD–92900–A; failed to document the source and/or adequacy of funds for the downpayment and/or closing costs; failed to properly verify the borrower’s income and/or stable employment history; failed to ensure that borrowers were not suspended, debarred or otherwise excluded from participating in the Department’s programs; and failed to develop and implement a Quality Control Plan in accordance with HUD/FHA requirements.


Action: Settlement Agreement signed October 20, 2006. Without admitting liability or fault, Faith Financial Group, Incorporated (Faith) agreed to pay HUD an administrative payment in the amount of $8,000.

Cause: The Board took this action based on the following violations of HUD/FHA requirements in the origination of HUD/FHA-insured loans where Faith: Failed to adopt, implement and maintain a Quality Control Plan in compliance with HUD/FHA requirements; and failed to ensure that its employees worked exclusively for Faith.

8. First Source Financial USA, Incorporated, Las Vegas, NV [Docket No. 06–6009 MR]

Action: On March 26, 2007, First Source Financial USA, Incorporated, Las Vegas, NV was served with the Government’s Complaint for Civil Money Penalty in the amount of $258,000.

Cause: The Board took this action based on the following violations of HUD/FHA requirements in the origination of HUD/FHA-insured loans where First Source Financial USA, Incorporated (First Source): Submitted false information in loan packages to HUD for HUD/FHA mortgage insurance; and engaged in prohibited net branching and prohibited loan origination arrangements.

9. Homewide Lending Corporation, City of Industry, CA [Docket No. 05–5062–MR]

Action: Settlement Agreement signed October 2, 2006. Without admitting liability or fault, Homewide Lending Corporation (Homewide) agreed to pay
HUD an administrative payment in the amount of $48,000.

**Cause:** The Board took this action based on the following violations of HUD/FHA requirements in the origination of HUD/FHA-insured loans where Homewide: Failed to implement Quality Control procedure; failed to document the source of Earnest Money Deposit funds; or funds to close; failed to document a stable two-year employment history for the borrowers; failed to ensure that borrower met the minimum credit requirements; and failed to reconcile incongruities in appraisals prior to submission to HUD, and/or accepted incomplete appraisal reports that did not support the final value consideration.

**12. Towne Mortgage and Realty, Sterling Heights, MI [Docket No. 06–6033–MR]**

**Action:** Settlement Agreement signed February 1, 2007. Without admitting liability or fault, Towne Mortgage (Towne) agreed to pay HUD an administrative payment of $26,601.37 ($20,601.37 as indemnification for two loans and $6,000 as an administrative payment).

**Cause:** The Board took this action based on the following violations of HUD/FHA requirements in the origination of HUD/FHA-insured loans where Towne: Failed to ensure borrowers met minimum credit requirements; and failed to properly verify borrower’s income and/or stability of income.

**13. USA Home Loans, Incorporated, Towson, MD [Docket No. 06–6029–MR]**

**Action:** On January 17, 2007, the Board issued a letter of reprimand to USA Home Loans, Incorporated (USA Home). The Board also imposed a civil money penalty in the amount of $2,000.

**Cause:** The Board took this action because USA Home used misleading advertising regarding the FHA Single Family Mortgage Insurance Premium refund program.

**Dated:** June 14, 2007.

Brian D. Montgomery,
Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** If you wish to comment on the ITP application and HCP, you may submit comments by any one of several methods. Please reference permit number TE154813–0 in such comments. You may mail comments to the Service’s South Florida Ecological Services Office (see **ADDRESSES**). You may also e-mail your comments to trish_adams@fws.gov. If you do not receive a confirmation from us that we have received your e-mail message, contact us directly at the telephone number listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. Finally, you may hand deliver comments to the South Florida Ecological Services Office (see **ADDRESSES**). Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comments, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Construction for the Project will take place within Section 8, Township 41 South, Range 43 East, Jupiter, Palm Beach County, Florida. This property is within scrub-jay occupied habitat. The Applicant will place 0.99 acre of upland habitat, 0.68 acre of which is occupied by scrub-jay, on their 4.07-acre lot in a conservation easement which will be enhanced and managed for scrub-jays. The conservation easement will be deeded to Palm Beach County.