BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION  

[DOCKET NO. CFPB–2021–0011]

AGENCY INFORMATION COLLECTION ACTIVITIES: COMMENT REQUEST

AGENCY: Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (Bureau) is requesting to revise an existing information collection, titled “Report of Terms of Credit Card Plans (Form FR 2572) and Consumer and College Credit Card Agreements.”

DATES: Written comments are encouraged and must be received on or before July 20, 2021 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by the title of the information collection, OMB Control Number (see below), and docket number (see above), by any of the following methods:
• Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
• Email: PRA_comments@cfpb.gov. Include Docket No. CFPB–2021–0011 in the subject line of the message.
• Mail/Hand Delivery/Courier: Comment intake, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (Attention: PRA Office), 1700 G Street NW, Washington, DC 20552. Please note that due to circumstances associated with the COVID–19 pandemic, the Bureau discourages the submission of comments by mail, hand delivery, or courier. Please note that comments submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. In general, all comments received will become public records, including any personal information provided. Sensitive personal information, such as account numbers or Social Security numbers, should not be included.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Documentation prepared in support of this information collection request is available at www.regulations.gov. Requests for additional information should be directed to Suzan Muslu, Data Governance Manager, at (202) 435–9276, or email: CFPB_PRA@cfpb.gov. If you require this document in an alternative electronic format, please contact CFPB_Accessibility@cfpb.gov. Please do not submit comments to these email boxes.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Report of Terms of Credit Card Plans (Form FR 2572) and Consumer and College Credit Card Agreements.

OMB Control Number: 3170–0001. Type of Review: Revision of a previously approved information collection.

Affected Public: Business and other for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 615.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 501.

Abstract: This collection incorporates two information collections of credit card data by the Bureau that used to be collected under separate OMB Control Numbers. OMB Control No. 3170–0052 is being incorporated into OMB Control Number 3170–0001. Each collects different forms of credit card data from credit card issuers, as required by the Truth in Lending Act (TILA), 15 U.S.C. 1601, et seq. and implementing regulations:
—Form FR 2572 collects data on credit card pricing and availability from a sample of at least 150 financial institutions that offer credit cards. The data enables the Bureau to present information to the public on terms of credit card plans:
—Sections 204 and 305 of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009 (CARD Act), amending TILA, and 12 CFR 1026.57(d) and 226.58 require card issuers to submit to the Bureau:
• Agreements between the issuer and a consumer under a credit card account for an open-end consumer credit plan; and
• any college credit card agreements to which the issuer is a party and certain additional information regarding those agreements.

The data collections enable the Bureau to provide Congress and the public with a centralized and searchable repository for consumer and college credit card agreements and information regarding the arrangements between financial institutions and institutions of higher education.

Request for Comments: Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the mandatory collection of information, pursuant to statute, is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) The accuracy of the Bureau’s estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methods and the assumptions used; (c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for Training and Public Land Withdrawal Extension, Fort Irwin, California

AGENCY: Department of the Army, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army announces the availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Training and Public Land Withdrawal Extension, Fort Irwin, California. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Draft EIS analyzes the potential environmental effects resulting from modernization of training activities and improvement of training facilities at the National Training Center (NTC) at Fort Irwin, California. The Army is also issuing this notice to inform the public that the EIS will serve as a Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (LEIS) to support the extension of the public land withdrawal for portions of Fort Irwin.

DATES: Comments must be received July 6, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be forwarded to the NEPA Planner, Fort Irwin Directorate of Public Works, Environmental Division, Building 602, Fifth Street, Fort Irwin, CA 92310–5083, email: usarmy.fbsa.aec.nepa@mail.mil.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jason Miller, Fort Irwin Public Affairs Office at 760–4511, Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. or via email at usarmy.irwin.ntc.mb.x.fort.irwin.ntc-eis-info-request@mail.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Fort Irwin consists of approximately 753,537 acres in the Mojave Desert in San Bernardino County in southern California. The NTC at Fort Irwin provides combined arms training for maneuver Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs), including the Army’s Stryker BCTs and Armored BCTs. Training also is provided for joint military branches (Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force), Army Reserve, National Guard units, and regular and transitional law enforcement units, as well as home station units. Because of its size, design, and terrain, Fort Irwin is one of the few places in the world where brigade-size units (5,000+ soldiers) can test their combat readiness.

Fort Irwin’s mission is to train Rotational Training Units (RTUs) and joint, interagency, and multinational partners to fight and win in a complex world, while taking care of soldiers, civilians, and family members. To achieve this mission, NTC designs and executes training exercises that prepare brigade-level units for operational deployments. Up to 12 BCT rotations are executed per year.

The Draft EIS analyzes the potential effects from the modernization of training, the improvement of training infrastructure, and the extension of the existing land withdrawal. Training changes are required to support new training doctrine that focuses on large Army formations operating against near-peer adversaries. To reflect weapon systems capabilities and evolving mission requirements, improvements need to be made to training infrastructure.

Approximately 110,000 acres of Fort Irwin training land areas are public land that has been withdrawn from all types of appropriation and reserved for military purposes under Public Law 107–107 (2001). This public land withdrawal terminates on December 28, 2026. The Army has identified a continuing military need for the land beyond the termination date and intends to request that the U.S. Congress extend the withdrawal for at least 25 years, or in the alternative, for an indefinite period until there is no longer a military need for the land. Upon a separate application by the Army, the Bureau of Land Management will file in the Federal Register a separate notice of withdrawal extension application. The Final EIS will be submitted to the U.S. Congress as an LEIS to support the legislative request for extension of this withdrawal and reservation.

The Draft EIS analyzes a range of Proposed Mission Change Alternatives, a No Mission Change Alternative, a Withdrawal Extension Alternative, and a No Withdrawal Extension Alternative. The Mission Change Alternatives consist of different magnitudes of changes in training and training infrastructure; for Fort Irwin’s Western Training Area, the EIS considers a range of medium-to-heavy intensity training alternatives. The No Mission Change Alternative would continue military training at the current level and would result in no modernization of training or improvement of training infrastructure on Fort Irwin. The Army is the decision maker regarding the Mission Change Alternatives.

The Withdrawal Extension Alternative would extend the current withdrawal for 25 years or indefinitely until there is no longer a military need for the land. The No Withdrawal Extension Alternative would result in portions of the installation returning to public domain. The U.S. Congress is the decision maker regarding the Withdrawal Alternatives.

All military activities under consideration would be conducted within the existing boundaries of the installation. The Draft EIS evaluates the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental and socioeconomic effects of these alternatives. Adverse effects would be minimized to the extent possible through the implementation of specified avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures.

The Army Preferred Alternative has not been determined at this time and will be specified in the Final EIS.

The resource areas analyzed in the DEIS include air quality, transportation, noise, water resources, geological resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, utilities, land use, recreation, health and safety, and hazardous materials and waste. The effects on these resources may occur from changing the scope or magnitude of military training activities within the current Fort Irwin boundaries. The analysis also considers the potential for cumulative environmental effects.

Both the Mission Change Alternatives and the No Mission Change Alternative would result in unavoidable environmental effects. Under the No Mission Change Alternative, there would be less than significant effects on all evaluated resources. The Mission Change Alternatives would result in minor-to-moderate adverse effects that would be in addition to the effects of the No Mission Change Alternative; however, none of the effects would be significant.

The environmental effects from the Withdrawal Extension Alternative would be comparable to those discussed for the Mission Change Alternatives. While the effects of the No Withdrawal Extension Alternative are uncertain,