

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR AN  
INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST (ICR)**

**1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE INFORMATION COLLECTION**

**1(a) Title: Pesticide Spray Drift Reduction Technologies**

**EPA ICR No.: 2472.01**

**OMB Control No.: 2070-NEW**

**1(b) Short Characterization**

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or the Agency) is seeking approval for a new information collection request (ICR). EPA intends to initiate a voluntary information collection for research to verify the effectiveness of application technologies for agricultural pesticide sprays that have the potential to significantly reduce pesticide spray drift. The focus of this research is on technologies, such as spray nozzles, shrouds and shields, and nozzle/drift reducing adjuvant chemical combinations, which are used for aerial or groundboom applications to row and field crops. Collectively these technologies are referred to as drift reduction technologies (DRTs).

The voluntary program would encourage the identification and use of DRTs that can substantially reduce drift of pesticide spray droplets from the target application site (e.g., a corn field) downwind to non-target areas. Exposures and adverse effects to humans, wildlife, and crops and other vegetation from pesticide spray drift are well recognized. Published research suggests 1 – 10% or more of applied agricultural pesticide sprays drift from the target field.

EPA believes there are application technologies that have the potential to significantly reduce the amount of spray drift. Studies conducted to measure spray drift reduction would verify the percent reduction achieved, and thus identify these technologies. EPA, with input from a variety of stakeholders, has developed a testing protocol appropriate to the needs of this voluntary program.

As manufacturers become aware of this program and begin to complete verification studies of their technologies (in accordance with the protocol), they would submit the test data to EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) for evaluation. EPA/OPP will evaluate each data submission and, if appropriate, assign a drift reduction rating to the specific tested technology (e.g., a nozzle) based on the technology's reduction in potential spray drift as compared to a standard application technology. The rating categories are described in section 2(b). EPA/OPP will then post on its website the identification of the manufacturer, its validated technology, and the EPA-assigned DRT rating.

A pesticide registrant would have the option of selecting one or more categories of DRT-rated technologies (e.g., one star, two star, etc.) for the pesticide product label that is sent to EPA for approval. As part of the label approval process, EPA would consider the rating category, (along with the appropriate drift reduction factor), in its risk assessment and risk management decisions. Upon EPA's approval of that label, the applicator would refer to the website to

identify verified DRTs whose use could be compatible with their application and then follow the label directions for the DRT-rated technology selected for use.

Use of DRT technologies offers the potential for (1) fewer/reduced application restrictions needed to mitigate spray drift from the intended application site(s), (2) application of more of the spray on the target site or crop which can improve efficacy, (3) a reduction in the associated potential risks, and (4) a reduction in costs to the applicator and grower (reduced potential for insurance claims and enforcement penalties). Thus, applicators and growers will have incentives to use these drift reduction technologies. As applicators and growers use DRTs on a more routine basis, benefits will accrue. Less pesticide loss to non-target sites means more of the applied pesticides are deposited on the intended sites. This results in improved efficacy, reduced costs to applicators and growers, and reductions in overall risks.

## **2. NEED FOR AND USE OF THE COLLECTION**

### **2(a) Need/Authority for the Collection**

For the purpose of this document, pesticide spray drift is defined as the physical movement of pesticide droplets through the air at the time of application or soon thereafter from the target site to any non- or off-target site. This does not include pesticide movements by erosion, migration, volatility, or windblown soil particles after application. Spray drift is dependent on the design of application equipment, size of spray droplets, weather conditions, and other factors.

Today, there is increased sensitivity to spray drift due to increased suburban development in agricultural areas and the need to protect threatened or endangered species. Spray drift management is of interest to pesticide and other chemical manufacturers, application equipment manufacturers, growers, pesticide applicators, government agencies, advocacy groups, and the public.

Under Section 3 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (Attachment A), EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) licenses (or registers) pesticide products. The EPA/OPP is charged with licensing the sale and use of pesticides and ensuring that when applicators use pesticides according to product label directions, the pesticides will not cause unreasonable adverse effects to humans or the environment. To perform these important functions, EPA must rely, in part, on quality scientific data and other information to estimate a pesticide's potential hazards, exposures, and risks from its intended use. An important component of this scientific assessment is the potential risks to humans and the environment from pesticide droplets or particles that drift from the application target site (e.g., a corn field) during or shortly after application. Generally, applications of most if not all sprays result in some amount of drift: it is not possible to completely eliminate drift.

EPA has spent considerable time and resources reviewing the best available science to better understand and estimate drift. Given our current understanding, we know that application technologies and how they are used, meteorological conditions, and applicator behavior can profoundly affect the amount of pesticide spray drift.

Over the years, industry, pesticide applicators, and university and government researchers have developed and employed a variety of pesticide application strategies and technologies to reduce spray drift. Examples of drift reduction technologies include spray nozzles, shrouds and

shields, and nozzle/drift reducing adjuvant chemical combinations. Although these and other technologies have the potential to reduce pesticide spray drift, there is often uncertainty about their effectiveness or performance. Verification testing of technologies would provide quantitative, quality-assured data regarding the specific effectiveness of the tested technology to reduce spray drift. EPA believes that equipment manufacturers, pesticide registrants, and others who have an interest in reducing spray drift can conduct these verification studies using EPA's test methods or another suitable peer-reviewed method provided they have access to appropriate test equipment and facilities. In this document, EPA refers to these entities collectively as manufacturers. These studies will demonstrate the potential for individual technologies to reduce spray drift by reducing the amount of the smallest droplets in spray that are most subject to drift, by trapping droplets within shields or shrouds around spray nozzles, or by other means.

EPA envisions that use of DRTs referenced on pesticide product labels submitted by registrants (for approval) will be included in the agency's pesticide risk assessments and risk management decisions for establishing application restrictions.

Use of these DRTs in the application of pesticides has the potential for significant benefits. Benefits to growers and applicators would include:

- Substantiated, accepted performance claims of the verified technologies
- Greater deposition of applied pesticides on the target sites/crops which may result in improved efficacy of pest or weed control
- With greater on-target deposition, potential reductions in application rates with a commensurate reduction in application costs
- Reduction of the currently estimated application restrictions for preventing adverse effects (e.g., smaller or no buffer zones)
- Applications can be made with increased flexibility in application timing and options potentially saving applicators time and costs
  - Applications under a wider range of environmental and application method conditions
- Reduced spray drift resulting in fewer incidents of adverse effects
  - Fewer claims of violations of pesticide labeling requirements that need to be investigated by enforcement authorities
  - Reduction in enforcement violation penalties
  - Less litigation and associated costs, including insurance claim costs

Benefits to manufacturers and pesticide registrants would include:

- Increased demand for DRT-rated equipment and pesticide products offering the option of DRT application methods on the label as applicators and growers use DRTs on a more routine basis.

Benefits to the public and the environment would include:

- Reduced spray drift means fewer incidents of adverse effects from spray drift to humans, and terrestrial and aquatic organisms and ecosystems, including threatened or endangered species.

For its voluntary program, EPA intends to use a 'star' rating system similar to that used by the United Kingdom (U.K.). (See <http://www.pesticides.gov.uk/guidance/industries/pesticides/topics/using-pesticides/spray-drift/leraps/local-environment-risk-assessment-for-pesticides-leraps.htm>). Similarities with the

U.K.'s system may enable uniformity for star ratings of technologies that could be marketed in both countries.

Similar to the U.K. voluntary program, EPA's voluntary program would verify performance of the DRT and provide a website with the rating information for each verified DRT. The website would also provide guidance to manufacturers on participating in this voluntary program and guidance to pesticide applicators for selecting DRTs with specific 'star' ratings as specified on pesticide product labels. The ability to incorporate information on the effectiveness of DRTs into Agency risk assessments and risk management decisions should allow pesticide applications that are protective of the environment and the health of those in the vicinity. Increasing the use of verified DRTs should allow more targeted, and therefore more effective, pesticide applications while significantly increasing public health and environmental protection by reducing the drift of pesticides to areas beyond the application sites.

## **2(b) Practical Utility/Users of the Data**

Every registered pesticide product has a label that contains specific use directions and restrictions on how applicators are to properly and safely use the product. EPA relies on scientific information and risk assessments to determine use restrictions appropriate for specific products and uses. EPA routinely uses models, such as AGDRIFT<sup>®</sup> and AGDISP, to estimate the deposition of spray droplets downwind from the application site. In its risk assessment, EPA/OPP correlates a pesticide's toxicity values with the estimated amounts of off-target spray drift to determine potential risks to sensitive sites, species, and humans. This analysis provides the basis for risk management measures, such as a buffer zone and its size, maximum wind velocity, pesticide release height, spray quality, and other application variables, to prevent unreasonable risks.

DRT verification testing would be performed according to a protocol (Generic Verification Protocol for Testing Pesticide Application Spray Drift Reduction Technologies for Row and Field Crops (Attachment C)) developed with input from the Stakeholder Technical Panel (described in section 3(c)). Testing conducted according to this protocol or a suitable peer-reviewed alternative will provide high quality data. The protocol addresses three testing approaches: low speed wind tunnels (to simulate application by groundboom equipment), high speed wind tunnels (to simulate application by aircraft), and field testing (groundboom or aerial application). One of the most important concepts in the protocol is the use of a reference nozzle. EPA's protocol was specifically designed to include a reference nozzle. By requiring the use of a specific reference nozzle EPA can compare technologies and make sure that, for example, a 25 percent reduction for one technology is consistent with the same 25 percent reduction for another technology.

Generally, testing of smaller technologies, such as spray nozzles or nozzle/adjuvant combinations, would be conducted in wind tunnels which measure the amount of the relatively smallest driftable droplets, which are referred to as fines. The DRT rating of the test nozzle is determined by calculating the percent reduction of driftable fractions (fines) during the wind tunnel study. The DRT rating will be based on the difference between the amounts of driftable fines from the test and reference nozzles.

EPA believes that field studies will most likely be used to determine drift reduction for shrouds or other large equipment that cannot fit into a wind tunnel. Vendors may also choose to test nozzles and nozzle/adjuvant combinations with field studies. Unlike wind tunnels, DRT field studies will collect data on downwind deposition of droplets resulting from an application using the larger technology and the reference nozzle. Depositions are measured at varying distances. EPA can use these data to estimate the percent drift reduction from the use of the tested technology. Each of these field studies is likely to be unique, and involve case-by-case considerations.

EPA limited the protocol to technologies for application to row and field crops because a large majority of agricultural pesticides are applied to these crops by groundboom and aerial equipment. Thus, a focus on encouraging the use of DRTs for row and field crop uses should have an overall greater benefit to drift reduction. The Agency recognizes that verified DRTs for row and field crops may also be appropriate for use on other non-agriculture sites such as sod farms or golf courses as well as orchard/vineyard floors.

Use of a standardized DRT test protocol will enable EPA to make valid comparisons of test results from nozzle to nozzle, to nozzle/adjuvant combination to other tested technologies. The drift reduction estimated by the study results would then be used to assign the technology its DRT rating. EPA's protocol and a format for data submission will be available via the EPA website at <http://www.epa.gov/DRT>.

EPA's process for review of submitted studies would:

- Verify the adequacy of the study
- Determine the potential for the DRT to reduce drift compared to a reference
- Based on that comparison, assign each verified technology to one of four drift reduction categories represented by stars:
  - Less than 25% reduction = No DRT rating
  - 25 to 49% reduction = DRT\* rating
  - 50 to 74% reduction = DRT\*\* rating
  - 75 to 89% reduction = DRT\*\*\* rating
  - Equal to or greater than 90% reduction = DRT\*\*\*\* rating

As EPA/OPP rates technologies and makes the ratings available to the public via its website, EPA/OPP will encourage pesticide registrants to submit applications for new and amended registrations to include the use of verified DRTs on their product label use directions (e.g., "Apply this product with DRT\*\* technologies."), as an alternative option to using application technologies that do not have a DRT rating. Applications with non-rated technologies will likely have greater application restrictions. In review of these registration applications, EPA/OPP will "credit" the DRT-rated technology in the risk assessment-management decision (i.e., use a drift reduction factor in the risk assessment) instead of using a conservative default assumption that does not assume any spray drift reduction. Pesticide labels that include use directions that specify DRT-rated technologies would also specify spray drift risk management measures, such as buffer zones, maximum wind speed, or release height. Pesticide product labels will specify to use a technology with a particular DRT rating. Eventually, applicators will have a variety of technologies from which to choose once EPA/OPP has been able to review and rate multiple submissions on a variety of technologies.

Pesticide applications conducted in accordance with products labeled with the use of DRTs should result in significantly less off-target spray drift deposition and risk from applications, compared to applications conducted without the use of DRTs. Reduction in off-target deposition and risk could result in a lessening of application restrictions necessary to prevent adverse risks from spray drift, such as reduction or elimination of a buffer zone, or allowing applications during greater wind velocity or release height. Conversely, for identical or substantially similar pesticides without a DRT claim, EPA/OPP cannot apply the credit of a DRT claim and therefore would likely require greater application restrictions to address potentially greater off-target drift and risks.

Pesticide registrants could choose to label their products for use with both standard application equipment (non-DRT), as most are currently labeled, and DRT-rated equipment or technologies, thus giving the applicator a choice. In this case such labels would have two sets of application restrictions: one set of restrictions if the product is applied without DRT and another set of restrictions if the product is applied with a DRT.

EPA anticipates labels would have a table, similar to the following, to express possible buffer zones, or other key application parameters such as maximum wind speed or release height.

Label Directions--	Droplet Size	Buffer Zone (ft)	
		Aquatic	Terrestrial
Non-DRT Rated Technology	Fine to Medium	100	25
DRT* Rated Technology	---	25	25
DRT** Rated Technology	---	15	10

The buffer zones for a particular label would be calculated specific to the active ingredients in the product and the use patterns on that label. The buffer zones on any particular label would represent the buffer needed for the most sensitive of the non-target species.

In preparing to make a pesticide application labeled with a DRT claim, applicators would refer to the EPA website to identify the specific application technologies which have the DRT star rating on the pesticide product label. For example, products labeled for use with DRT\*\*\* technologies, the applicator would refer to the EPA's DRT website to see the identities of the specific DRT\*\*\* rated technologies to make the application. Additionally, EPA expects manufacturers of the verified DRTs will identify those technologies in their catalogs and on their websites.

### **3. NON-DUPLICATION, CONSULTATIONS, AND OTHER COLLECTION CRITERIA**

#### **3(a) Non-Duplication**

OPP is not aware of any public or private assembly of verification data on the efficiency of DRT technologies. Since each equipment or technology manufacturer would submit information unique to its products offered for sale, duplication is unlikely to occur.

### **3(b) Public Notice Required Prior to ICR Submission to OMB**

Pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.8(d), on November 21, 2012, EPA published a Notice in the **Federal Register** (77 FR 69823) announcing this proposed information collection activity and providing a 60-day public comment period. That Notice as well as the support documents, public comments submitted, and the agency's responses to those comments are available at <http://www.regulations.gov> using the docket identifier EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0631. EPA also received comments from another Federal Agency, whose comments have been considered and addressed as appropriate.

### **3(c) Consultations**

In 2006, EPA established a technical panel to develop test methods to verify the potential effectiveness of drift reduction technologies. The technical panel includes representatives from EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs and Office of Research and Development, other government agencies (United States Department of Agriculture, California Department of Pesticide Regulation, and Canada's Pesticide Management Regulatory Agency), pesticide and application equipment industries, pesticide applicators, growers, environmental interests and university researchers. While the work of the panel to produce the verification protocol is considered to be completed, EPA continues to coordinate informational activities with panel members.

Since 2006, EPA has made presentations to various entities. A few recent examples are:

- August 2011, at the Pesticide Application and Drift Modeling Workshop in Christchurch, New Zealand,
- February 2012, at the Weed Science Society of America 2012 Annual Meeting,
- May 2012, at a meeting of the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC) there was an update on DRT Technology. (see <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/ppdc/>),
- May 2012, at the Council of Producers and Distributors of Agrotechnology, 2012 Adjuvants and Inerts Annual Conference,
- August 2012, a webinar for members of the Agricultural Retailers Association,
- April 2013, at the State-FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group Meeting,
- May 2013, at the Council of Producers and Distributors of Agrotechnology, 2013 Adjuvants and Inerts Annual Conference,
- August 2013, at the Agrochemical Formulation USA Workshop,
- December 2013, at the Minnesota Crop Pest Management Course.

During and after these presentations, many stakeholders provided information to EPA that was considered in the development of this program.

As part of these contacts, EPA has been advised that several manufacturers are conducting, or in the near future anticipate conducting, studies to measure spray drift reduction. Such studies could be submitted to EPA as “stand-alone” submissions from an equipment manufacturer in which the applicant only seeks to have his technology receive a ‘star-rating’ and posting on the DRT website. Alternatively, the study could be submitted as part of an application for registration or amended registration of a pesticide product. As part of that process, EPA would approve the use directions for the label for use of ‘star-rated’ drift reduction technologies.

During the 60-day public comment period after publication of the **Federal Register** Notice, as part of a consultation process, EPA contacted five stakeholders to seek specific feedback on the practical utility of the voluntary information requested, the respondent burdens or costs estimated by EPA, clarity of guidance provided, and collection methods. Three of the these stakeholders responded. The consultation comments are included in Attachment E.

Two of the stakeholders noted that there is a significant body of wind tunnel and drift studies in the public literature. Some of the data may meet the needs of EPA. EPA understands the stakeholders concern since it was also a concern identified in the public comments. See response to comment 20. One of the stakeholders considered the scope of the program to be narrow and asked that EPA consider a tiered approach: The second Tier could move beyond the equipment DRT-ratings and focus on formulation technology. EPA may consider such an approach at some time in the future.

Two stakeholders believe that the data report to be submitted to EPA could be clearer. As discussed in response to comment 26, EPA intends to develop a template type of format for reporting DRT data to EPA.

All stakeholders currently keep their records electronically. Stakeholders believe that the option for electronic submission has potential and could lead to efficiencies. Two stakeholders generally agree that the cost of conducting the DRT studies, in the US, is accurate. One of these stakeholders also believes that costs would increase if testing is outside the US. One respondent asked for additional information on any required recordkeeping.

### **3(d) Effects of Less Frequent Collection**

Not applicable. Since this is a voluntary information collection, each manufacturer would determine if they wished to submit information to EPA, and their schedule for doing so.

### **3(e) Compliance with General OMB Guidelines**

This collection of information is consistent with all OMB guidelines under 5 CFR 1320.6.

### **3(f) Confidentiality**

EPA will not collect proprietary trade secrets or other proprietary information. The publically available information would be limited to the name of the technology manufacturer company, the name of and description of the technology, and the ‘star’ rating assigned by the agency. Confidentiality of respondent information (the submitted studies) will be ensured to the maximum extent allowed by law. The information collection will comply with the Privacy Act.



### 3(g) Sensitive Questions

The information requested under this voluntary collection does not include questions of a sensitive nature. Under this ICR, agricultural equipment manufacturers would submit to EPA research conducted according to protocols that were developed in cooperation with a Stakeholder Technical Panel.

## 4. THE RESPONDENTS AND THE INFORMATION REQUESTED

### 4(a) Respondents/NAICS Codes

Potential respondents affected by the voluntary collection activities under this ICR include pesticide application equipment manufacturers, chemical manufacturers, pesticide registrants, university researchers, and others who have an interest in reducing spray drift. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes for the principal respondents are:

Producers of pesticide products	32532
Crop Production	111
Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, Life Sciences	541710
Colleges, universities, and professional schools	611310

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action.

### 4(b) Respondent Activities

EPA believes that most respondents will contract with a testing facility to conduct study(ies) that meet the criteria in the testing protocol. (Attachment C) This may involve the following activities:

- Make arrangements for testing with a contract laboratory
- Submit contractor-prepared study reports to EPA for review and evaluation

## 5. THE INFORMATION COLLECTED - AGENCY ACTIVITIES, COLLECTION METHODOLOGY, AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

### 5(a) Agency Activities

EPA will perform the following activities under this ICR:

- Review and evaluate the submitted study: Assign a drift reduction ‘star’ rating
- Post rating on EPA’s website (<http://www.epa.gov/DRT>)

Although EPA has discussed the need to conduct risk assessments that credit the use of DRT, such risk assessments will be part of the label review process conducted as part of a registration action. (Registration actions are already covered under a different ICR.)

## **5(b) Collection Procedures**

Equipment manufacturers, chemical manufacturers, pesticide registrants, university researchers, and others who have an interest in reducing spray drift determine to “opt-in” to the voluntary program and submit information to EPA. EPA is not requiring submission of this information, and does not intend to issue a Data Call-In for DRT studies. This means that EPA will collect only the information submitted.

## **5(c) Small Entity Flexibility**

Small businesses can choose whether or not to participate in the voluntary program by arranging for the needed testing, and then submitting the study to EPA. Since this is a voluntary submission, there are no deadlines, and small businesses can create their own submission schedules.

## **5(d) Collection Schedule**

There is no collection schedule. Potential respondents can choose whether or not to participate in the voluntary program, as well as the timing of any submissions. EPA anticipates that 4 to 7 companies would submit studies for review and evaluation over the first year of the ICR. Some of these same companies could continue to submit studies during the remaining years of the ICR. EPA has identified a number of equipment manufacturing companies, pesticide registrants, and adjuvant chemical manufacturing companies that could be interested in submitting DRT studies to EPA. EPA estimates that 12 companies could submit studies during the 3-year timeframe covered under this ICR. A study is a submission that could have the results of testing one or more nozzles, one or more adjuvant chemicals, one larger piece of equipment, or a combination of technologies.

# **6 ESTIMATING THE BURDEN AND COST OF THE COLLECTION**

## **6(a) Estimating Respondent Burden and Cost**

As described previously in this ICR (see section 4(b)), the respondents are expected to engage in the following activities when they contract with a testing facility to participate in the voluntary research program under this ICR:

- Make arrangements for testing with a contract laboratory
- Submit contractor-prepared study reports to EPA for review and evaluation

The potential respondent burden hours were estimated using the estimated test costs, and the estimated fully loaded hourly rate for a technical staff person or manager (\$135/hr.). EPA obtained cost estimates for testing from two sources.

- The estimate to conduct and report a wind tunnel test is a cost up to \$6,000, with an average estimated burden of 44 hours.
- The estimate to conduct and report a field study is a cost up to \$100,000, with an average estimated burden of 740 hours.

EPA believes that most manufacturers of nozzles and other small technologies would opt to conduct a wind tunnel test if applicable for their technology. EPA estimates 20 studies could be submitted during the 3-year period under this ICR. Therefore, 20 studies at \$6,000 and burden of 44 hours per study would yield a cost of \$120,000 and burden of 880 hours during the 3 years, for an average yearly cost of \$40,000 and burden of 293 hours. EPA also estimates that one field study would be submitted during the 3-year period, for an average yearly cost of \$33,000 and burden of 246 hours. The combined yearly cost is \$73,000 (\$40,000 + \$33,000), and yearly burden is 539 hours. The average cost per response is \$10,476 (\$220,000/21), and the average burden per response is 77 hours (1620/21).

There are no capital expenditures, or operation and maintenance costs associated with this information collection activity.

#### 6(b) Estimating Agency Burden and Cost

The review of a DRT study would combine primary contractor review and secondary EPA review. The following table provides the estimated cost for EPA to review one study.

<b>Contractor</b>			
Level	Contractor Rate (\$/hr)	Hours	Cost (\$)
Junior Level	180	36	6480
Senior Level	240	4	960
Administration	160	1	160
<b>EPA</b>			
Level	Fully Loaded Wage Rate (\$/hr)	Hours	Cost (\$)
Technical	119.85	20	2,397
Managerial	71.58	2	143.16
Total Hours & Cost for Review of One Study =		63	10,140.16

The 3-year cost for EPA to review 20 wind tunnel studies and one field study would be \$10,140.16 (x 21) or \$212,943. The average cost for a year would be \$70,981.

The burden hours for 3 years for EPA to review 20 wind tunnel studies and one field study would be 63 (x 21) or 1,323 hours. The average burden for a year would be 441 hours.

#### 6(c) Burden Statement

EPA estimates the total annual respondent burden for the ICR entitled **Pesticide Spray Drift Reduction Technologies**, a new ICR, to be 539 hours, with an annualized cost of \$73,000. The average per response burden is 77 hours, with an average cost of \$10,476. Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.03(b). The Agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations, are listed in 40 CFR part 9, and appear on the information collection instrument as applicable, i.e., form or instructions.

The Agency has established a public docket for this ICR under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0631. It is available electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the

online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

A hard copy is available for viewing at the OPP Docket in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), located in EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20460. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305-5805). Please review the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at <http://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

You may submit comments regarding the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including the use of automated collection techniques.

Comments regarding burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden can be sent to: Director, Collection Strategies Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2822), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20460. You can also send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503, Attention: Desk Office for EPA. Include docket ID No. EPA-HQ- OPP-2012-0631 and OMB control number 2070-New in any correspondence.

## **ATTACHMENTS TO THE SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

Attachments to the supporting statement are available in the public docket established for this Information Collection Request (ICR) under the docket identification number **EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0631**. These attachments are available for online viewing at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) unless otherwise accessed as described in the sections below.

**Attachment A: 7 U.S.C. 136a - FIFRA Section 3:** This attachment can be accessed via the internet at: [http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/7/uscode/7\\_00000136---a000-.html](http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/7/uscode/7_00000136---a000-.html)

**Attachment B:** Red-Line/Strike-Out Version of “Generic Verification Protocol for Testing Pesticide Application Spray Drift Reduction Technologies for Row and Field Crops” to demonstrate the changes from the Draft Version 1.5 (September 2012) to the Final Version

**Attachment C:** Final Version of “Generic Verification Protocol for Testing Pesticide Application Spray Drift Reduction Technologies for Row and Field Crops”

**Attachment D:** Response to Comments Document

**Attachment E:** Consultation: Responses from Three Stakeholders

**Attachment F:** Draft Version of EPA’s Future Webpage

