A. No. EPA has determined that because the portable mixer has a capacity of less than 250 gallons, the portable mixer does not meet the definition of "process vessel," which is considered equipment that is part of an affected source under MACT subpart HHHHH. Additionally, as the portable mixer does not meet any other criteria for inclusion in the affected source, it is not part of the affected source under subpart HHHHH.

Abstract for [M090036]

Q: Does Aleris International's proposal for alternative methodologies to conduct stack testing, monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting for the aluminum scrap shredder and delacquering kiln at its facility in Uhrichsville, Ohio, comply with the requirements of 40 CFR part 63, subpart RRR?

A: Yes. Aleris International's proposal for alternative methodologies to conduct stack testing, monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting for the aluminum scrap shredder and delacquering kiln complies with MACT subpart RRR. EPA approves the proposed method for determining the delacquering kiln feed/charge weight during testing for the aluminum scrap shredder and delacquering kiln. EPA also approves using twelve-hour shifts for the shredder feed/charge weight during normal operations and keeping the delacquering kiln feed/charge rate in twelve-hour shifts.

Abstract for [M090038]

Q1: Does 40 CFR part 63, subpart ZZZZ, apply to non-road, non-stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines located at a major source of hazardous air pollutants?

A1: No. MACT subpart ZZZZ does not apply to non-road, non-stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines located at a major source of hazardous air pollutants.

Q2: Does 40 CFR part 60, subpart IIII, apply to non-road, non-stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines?

Ă2: No. NSPS subpart IIII does not apply to non-road, non-stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines.

Abstract for [M090039]

Q1: Does EPA approve a request to waive the performance testing requirements of 40 CFR part 63, subpart PPPPPP, for two Hardinage ball mills at the Johnson Controls Battery Group (Johnson Controls) facility in Holland, Ohio, based upon the performance test results from similar affected sources at Johnson Controls facility in Tampa, Florida?

A1: No. EPA does not approve the request under MACT subpart PPPPPP. The affected sources are located at different facilities in different states, and maximum production capacities differ by 400-pounds per hour. Also, Johnson Controls has not conducted a performance test at the Tampa affected facilities since November 2002.

Q2: Does EPA approve a request from Johnson Controls to use the performance test results from two cast-on-strap (COS) lines to demonstrate compliance under 40 CFR part 63, subpart PPPPPP, for the four other COS lines at its facility in Holland, Ohio?

A2: No. EPA does not approve this request under MACT subpart PPPPPP. Johnson Controls did not submit a copy of any test reports for any of the COS lines and did not submit any information to demonstrate that the six COS lines were produced by the same manufacturer, have the same model number or other manufacturer's designation in common, and have the same rated capacity and operating specifications.

Abstract for [M090040]

Q: Will EPA reconsider its September 25, 2008, disapproval of a request to waive the stack testing requirements for six cast-on-strap lines at Johnson Controls Battery Group's lead acid battery facility in Holland, Ohio?

A: No. Johnson Controls Battery Group has not demonstrated that the performance tests are impractical or technically or economically infeasible. EPA affirms its previous decision.

Abstract for [M090041]

Q: Does EPA waive the closed vent system inspection procedures using Method 21 of 40 CFR part 60 for addon air pollution control equipment subject to 40 CFR part 63, subparts WWWW and SS, given that EPA has made such a determination with respect to 40 CFR part 261, subpart CC?

A: No. EPA has previously determined that when waste management units are required to use air emissions control under both RCRA and CAA NESHAP, it is unnecessary for owners and operators of those waste management units subject to air standards under both sets of rules to perform duplicative testing and monitoring, keep duplicative sets of records, or perform other duplicative actions. Given no applicable RCRA air regulations, EPA finds that the facts here do not justify waiving the closed vent inspection procedures using Method 21.

Abstract for [M090042]

Q: Does EPA approve the request of Aleris International for a waiver of the performance testing required for scrap shredders under 40 CFR part 63, subpart RRR, for the ring crusher at its Wabash Alloys facility in Wabash, Indiana?

A: Yes. EPA approves the request under MACT subpart RRR, as the facility has demonstrated that it is technically infeasible to use Method 5 to measure emissions. Because Method 9 visible emissions readings showed uncontrolled opacity far below the limit for a controlled source, this provides assurance that the ring crusher is in continuous compliance with the PM standard.

Abstract for [M090043]

Q: Is Spirit Aerosystems (Spirit) responsible under 40 CFR part 63, subpart GGGGG, for remediation activities conducted and controlled by Boeing on Spirit Aerosystems' property?

A: No. This is a unique situation in which Boeing is legally responsible for compliance with MACT subpart GGGGG. Although Spirit purchased the existing site from Boeing, Boeing retained ownership of the remediation unit "facilities" located on the site, along with the environmental liability. Prior to Spirit's purchase of the property, a Kansas Department of Health and Environment Consent Order was signed requiring Boeing to conduct remediation activities at the site.

Abstract for [Z090003]

Q: Does EPA approve the request of Dow Chemical Company (Dow) to use insulation plugs to access the insulated valve stem interface for valves subject to 40 CFR part 63, subpart H, at its Midland, Michigan facility?

A: Yes. EPA approves Dow's request. Using insulation plugs is a feasible and adequate way under MACT subpart H of monitoring the insulated valves at Dow's Midland plant site while still maintaining the integrity and functionality of the insulation.

Dated: November 5, 2009.

Lisa Lund,

Director, Office of Compliance. [FR Doc. E9–29067 Filed 12–4–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FARM CREDIT SYSTEM INSURANCE CORPORATION

Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board; Regular Meeting

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the regular meeting of the Farm Credit

System Insurance Corporation Board (Board).

DATE AND TIME: The meeting of the Board will be held at the offices of the Farm Credit Administration in McLean, Virginia, on December 10, 2009, from 10:30 a.m. until such time as the Board concludes its business.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roland E. Smith, Secretary to the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board, (703) 883–4009, TTY (703) 883– 4056.

ADDRESSES: Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Parts of this meeting of the Board will be open to the public (limited space available) and parts will be closed to the public. In order to increase the accessibility to Board meetings, persons requiring assistance should make arrangements in advance. The matters to be considered at the meeting are:

Open Session

A. Approval of Minutes

• September 10, 2009.

B. Business Reports

• September 30, 2009 Financial Reports;

 Report on Insured and Other Obligations;

• Quarterly Report on Annual Performance Plan.

C. New Business

• Board Meeting Schedule for 2010;

• Review of FCSIC's Allowance for

Loss Procedures.

Closed Session

 Confidential Report on System Performance;

• Audit Plan for the Year Ended December 31, 2009.

Dated: December 2, 2009.

Roland E. Smith,

Secretary, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation Board.

[FR Doc. E9–29113 Filed 12–4–09; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6710–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The applications also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1843). Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States. Additional information on all bank holding companies may be obtained from the National Information Center website at www.ffiec.gov/nic/.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than January 2, 2010.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (Steve Foley, Vice President) 1000 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30309:

1. Granvalor Holding LTD., Tortola, British Virgin Islands; to acquire up to an additional 10.94 percent, for a total of 60 percent, of the voting shares of International Bancorp of Miami, Inc., and thereby indirectly acquire additional voting shares of Bank of Miami, N.A., both of Coral Gables, Florida.

B. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago (Colette A. Fried, Assistant Vice President) 230 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60690–1414:

1. United Bancorp, Inc., Chatham, Illinois; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Marine Bank & Trust, Carthage, Illinois, and Brown County Bank, Mount Sterling, Illinois.

C. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (Kenneth Binning, Vice President, Applications and Enforcement) 101 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105–1579:

1. Golden Pacific Bancorp, Inc., Sacramento, California; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 100 percent of the voting shares of Gold Country Financial Services, Inc., and thereby indirectly acquire voting shares of Gold Country Bank, National Association, both of Marysville, California.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, December 2, 2009.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board. [FR Doc. E9–29091 Filed 12–4–09; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6210–01–S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[OMB Control No. 9000-0068]

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Submission for OMB Review; Economic Price Adjustment

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). **ACTION:** Notice of request for reinstatement of an information collection requirement regarding an existing OMB clearance.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Regulatory Secretariat will be submitting to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve a reinstatement of a previously approved information collection requirement concerning economic price adjustment. A request for public comments was published in the **Federal Register** at 74 FR 27025, on June 5, 2009. No comments were received.

Public comments are particularly invited on: Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the FAR, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. DATES: Submit comments on or before January 6, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information,