

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT
MANAGEMENT OFFICIAL INTERLOCKS
OMB CONTROL NO. 1550-0051**

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Circumstance and Need

Notwithstanding these general prohibitions, § 563f.4 provides that prohibited interlocking relationships will not apply in the case of one or more of the following organizations or to a subsidiary thereof: (1) a depository institution that does not do business within the United States; (2) a corporation operating under Section 25 or Section 25A of the Federal Reserve Act; (3) a depository organization that has been placed formally in liquidation, or which is in the hands of a receiver, conservator, or other official exercising a similar function; (4) a credit union being served by a management official of another credit union; (5) a state-chartered savings and loan guaranty corporation; (6) a Federal Home Loan Bank or any other bank organized solely to serve depository institutions or solely for the purpose of providing securities clearing services and services related thereto for depository institutions and securities companies; and (7) a depository organization that is closed or is in danger of closing as determined by the appropriate Federal depository institutions regulatory agency and is acquired by another depository organization.

There are no third party requirements.

2. Use of Information Collected

OTS uses the requested information to evaluate the merits of interlocks exemption applications. In evaluating the merits, OTS uses the information to determine: (a) whether the services to be performed by the person in question are necessary or desirable for the purpose of preserving safe and sound operations, thereby protecting the insurance risk to the Deposit Insurance Fund (“DIF”); (b) if the institution is well managed and served by other fully competent directors, officers or employees; (c) if the person’s background, including any past history in dealing with regulatory authorities, indicates an ability to operate a savings association in a safe and sound manner; (d) if the credentials of the person in question are such that the services to be performed would be particularly valuable to the savings association; and (e) if the service of the individual in management positions at unaffiliated depository organizations is likely to result in a monopoly or substantial lessening of competition.

3. Use of Technology to Reduce Burden

Improved information technology has been considered but not found to be feasible. This information is best obtained by the proposed information collection procedures. The use of automated systems by savings associations may be helpful in satisfying the reporting

requirements of the regulations. In this regard, the use of improved technology has been accounted for in the total burden imposed on savings associations and is neither significant nor measurable. Since automated information systems may be used in a very limited capacity to obtain or process the information required by the proposed information collection, and because these systems vary from institution to institution, the use of improved technology to reduce the burden is not applicable.

4. **Efforts to Identify Duplication**

This information collection is not duplicative within the meaning of the PRA and OMB regulations. Information that is similar to or that corresponds to information that could serve OTS's purpose and need in this information collection is not being collected by any other means or for any other purpose; nor is this information otherwise available in the detail necessary to satisfy the purpose and need for which this collection of information is undertaken. Only the institution requesting the management interlock can provide the specific details of the interlock.

5. **Minimizing the Burden on Small Firms**

Any institution requesting a management interlock must provide the information. Some of these institutions may be considered small businesses. The information collection does not differentiate information requirements on the basis of an institution's size because OTS is responsible for evaluating each of these requests, regardless of the applicant's size.

6. **Consequences of Less Frequent Collection**

The information is submitted only when an institution requests permission to begin or continue a management interlock, and the specified interlock does not comply with the provisions set forth in Part 563f of OTS regulations. Inasmuch as the information relates to the individual in question, it would be impossible for OTS to evaluate the proposed management interlock if an institution or holding company does not submit the required information each time an interlock is proposed.

7. **Special Circumstances**

The information collection, under certain situations, requires two copies of the filing in addition to the number required in accordance with the guidelines set out in 5 C.F.R. 1320.6. The filing procedures for this application allow for simultaneous review in Washington and the Regional Offices.

8. **Consultation with Persons Outside OTS**

Notice of the intent to renew this information collection was published in the Federal Register, on August 12, 2008 (73 FR 156). OTS has not received any comments.

9. **Payment of Respondents**

No payments or gifts are made in connection with this information collection.

10. **Confidentiality**

Certain information is not available to the public including, among other things: (1) information exempt from disclosure by statute or executive order; (2) information contained or related to examination, operating or condition reports prepared by agency use; and (3) privileged information related to the business, personal, or financial affairs of any person that is furnished in confidence. The application to be used for the collection indicates that the information will be confidential as it relates to the business, personal, and financial affairs of an individual.

11. **Information of a Sensitive Nature**

No questions of a sensitive nature are required by the information collection.

12. **Annual Hour Burden Estimate**

The total annual hour burden to the respondent is estimated at 12 hours, representing 3 responses at 4 hours per submission.

13. **Estimate of Annual Cost**

In addition to the filing fee of \$2,600, the annual cost to the respondent is estimated at \$600, representing a total of 12 hours at an average cost of \$50 per hour.

14. **Estimate of Annualized Cost to Government**

The cost to the government to process the application is \$2,600 which is the total filing fee based on estimated burden hours to review and process the application.

15. **Reason for Change in Burden**

OTS is not citing any changes in the burden.

16. **Publication**

Not applicable.

17. **Expiration Date**

No specific form is required by this information collection. The OMB Control Number is displayed in the regulation table at 12 CFR 506.1.

18. **Exceptions**

There are no exceptions to the certification on OMB Form 83-I.

B. COLLECTION OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

Not applicable.