not the engine is located at a major source or area source.

Abstract for [A130001]:
C:\Documents and Settings\mmalave\Local Settings\Temp\wzc696\A130001.pdf.
Q: The Asbestos Institute request clarification from EPA on whether the use of foam meet the “adequately wet” standard, as stated in the Asbestos NESHAP, 40 CFR part 61, subpart M?
A: EPA determines that as long as the foam is applied as a liquid and sufficiently mixes with or penetrates the asbestos-containing material and prevents visible emissions, the use of such foam is acceptable in meeting the adequately wet requirement under the Asbestos NESHAP. The response is limited to this question regarding foam as a wetting agent. It is the responsibility of the owner or operator to meet other asbestos emission control requirements (also known as “work practice standards”) during the demolition or renovation operation, as described in the EPA response letter.

Abstract for [M130002]:
C:\Documents and Settings\mmalave\Local Settings\Temp\wzc696\A130002.pdf.
Q: Cantey Hanger LLP request a determination for a client on whether only removing a 1500 foot section of the asbestos-containing material (ACM)-wrapped pipeline in a pipeline renovation project, while leaving the remainder of the non-friable ACM-wrapped pipeline in the ground, transform the site into a waste disposal site under 40 CFR 61.154 of 40 CFR part 61, subpart M (i.e., Asbestos NESHAP)?
A1: No. The Asbestos NESHAP does not apply to undisturbed pipelines coated with ACM that remain in the ground following a renovation project, which is the described scenario in your request, as long as no asbestos-containing waste material is deposited in the recently renovated area. This is consistent with a previously EPA issued applicability determination, ADI Control Number A030001 dated March 6, 2002.
A2: If no additional ACM is deposited at the site for a year, would the site become an inactive waste disposal site per 40 CFR 61.154(g)?
A2: Yes. If the renovated area does not receive asbestos-containing waste material, the site is not subject to the active waste disposal regulation at 40 CFR 61.154, in general and 40 CFR 61.154(g), specifically. Therefore, the inactive waste disposal requirement at 40 CFR 61.151 of the Asbestos NESHAP does not apply.

Abstract for [A130003]:
C:\Documents and Settings\mmalave\Local Settings\Temp\wzc696\A130003.pdf.
Q: Does 40 CFR part 61, subpart M (i.e., Asbestos NESHAP) apply to encapsulating wall board with spray foam insulation if the surface of the wall board will not be disturbed?
A: EPA is unable to comment on whether encapsulating wall board with spray foam insulation would be compliant with the Asbestos NESHAP based on the limited on site-specific information provided in the request. However, if the work you are contemplating does not involve wrecking or taking out load-bearing structures (demolition) or altering one or more facility components, including stripping or removing regulated asbestos-containing material (renovation), then the Asbestos NESHAP for demolition and renovation operations does not apply to the proposed action.

Abstract for [Z130001]:
C:\Documents and Settings\mmalave\Local Settings\Temp\wzc696\Z130001.pdf.
Q: Does EPA approve Valero Refinery’s (Valero) Alternative Monitoring Plan (AMP) for using a video camera to monitor a flare pilot flame in a control room and record the observation, in lieu of having an ultraviolet (UV) flame detector, as required by 40 CFR part 63 subpart CC, at Valero’s Three Rivers refinery in Texas?
A: No. EPA AMP since it determined that the equivalence of using a video camera that must be monitored by operations personnel in lieu of a continuous recording thermocouple or equivalent device was not demonstrated under 40 CFR 60.18(1)[2]. 40 CFR 63.644(a)(2) requires that a device that continuously detects the presence of a pilot flame must be used when the controlling device is a flare. 40 CFR 63.11(b)(5) requires that the monitoring device must be a thermocouple or equivalent device. A thermocouple has a continuous recording mechanism that is not dependent on operation or monitoring by personnel.

Abstract for [M130002]:
C:\Documents and Settings\mmalave\Local Settings\Temp\wzc696\M130002.pdf.
Q: Is the propane dehydrogenation (PDH) plant located at the Dow Chemical Company, Texas Operations (Dow) site subject to 40 CFR part 63 subpart YY (MON NESHAP) or subpart FFFF (GMACT and Ethylene MACT)?
A: EPA determines that Dow’s process is subject to the MON NESHAP, as it did not meet the criteria of an ethylene production process as defined by the Ethylene MACT due to the natural gas liquid feed stream and process conditions including temperature.
The new meeting dates are December 4–6, 2013.

DATES: The meeting will be held on December 4–6, 2013, from 9:00 a.m. to approximately 5:00 p.m.

Comments: The Agency encourages that written comments and requests for oral comments are submitted by November 26, 2013. However, written comments and requests to make oral comments may be submitted until the date of the meeting, but anyone submitting written comments after November 26, 2013 should contact the Designated Federal Official (DFO) listed under: FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT. For additional instructions, see the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Environmental Protection Agency, Conference Center, Lobby Level, One Potomac Yard (South Bldg.), 2777 S. Crystal Dr., Arlington, VA 22202.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Jenkins, DFO, Office of Science Coordination and Policy (7201M), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (202) 564–3327; fax number: (202) 564–8382; email address: Jenkins.fred@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A cancellation notice was published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2013 (78 FR 64211) (FRL–9902–06). All other information provided in the Federal Register on August 9, 2013 (78 FR 48672) (FRL–9394–3) remains unchanged.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests.

Dated: November 6, 2013.

Steven M. Knott,
Deputy Director, Office of Science Coordination and Policy.

[FR Doc. 2013–27263 Filed 11–13–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–01–P
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EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

[Public Notice 2013–3003]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

AGENCY: Export-Import Bank of the United States.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review and comments request.


AFFECTED PUBLIC: This form affects entities involved in the export of U.S. goods and services. 

Annual Number of Respondents: 2,600.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 15 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 7,800.

Frequency of Reporting of Use: Monthly.

Government Expenses:

Reviewing Time per Year: 7,800 hours.

Average Wages per Hour: $42.50.

Average Cost per Year: $331,500 (time*wages).

Benefits and Overhead: 20%.

Total Government Cost: $397,800.

Kalesha Malloy,
Agency Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[PR Doc. 2013–27191 Filed 11–13–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6690–01–P

---

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

[Public Notice 2013–3004]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

AGENCY: Export-Import Bank of the United States.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review and comments request.


AFFECTED PUBLIC: This form affects entities involved in the export of U.S. goods and services.

Annual Number of Respondents: 2,600.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 15 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 7,800.

Frequency of Reporting of Use: Monthly.

Government Expenses:

Reviewing Time per Year: 7,800 hours.

Average Wages per Hour: $42.50.

Average Cost per Year: $331,500 (time*wages).

Benefits and Overhead: 20%.

Total Government Cost: $397,800.

Kalesha Malloy,
Agency Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[PR Doc. 2013–27191 Filed 11–13–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6690–01–P