

Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate), (202) 622-7190, (not a toll-free number).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The subject of the public hearing is proposed regulations under section 6011(e) of the Internal Revenue Code. A notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing appearing in the Federal Register on Thursday, October 10, 1996 (61 FR 53161), announced that the public hearing on proposed regulations under section 6011 of the Internal Revenue Code would be held on Wednesday, February 5, 1997, beginning at 10:00 a.m., in the Commissioner's Conference Room, Room 3313, Internal Revenue Building, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C.

The public hearing scheduled for Wednesday, February 5, 1997, is cancelled. Cynthia E. Grigsby, Chief, Regulations Unit Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate).

[FR Doc. 97-2069 Filed 1-27-97; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4830-01-U

## FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

### 29 CFR Part 2704

#### Implementation of Equal Access to Justice Act in Commission Proceedings

**AGENCY:** Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission previously published, on December 19, 1996 (61 FR 66961), proposed revisions to its rules providing for the award of attorneys' fees and other expenses under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 5 U.S.C. 504. The period for comments to the proposed rules was set to end on January 21, 1997. A request was made that the comment period be extended and the Commission has agreed to do so.

**DATES:** Comments should be received by February 3, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be sent to Richard L. Baker, Executive Director, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, 1730 K Street, NW, 6th Floor, Washington, DC 20006. For the convenience of persons who will be reviewing the comments, it is requested that commenters provide an original and three copies of their comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Norman M. Gleichman, General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, 1730 K Street, NW, 6th Floor,

Washington, DC 20006, telephone: 202-653-5610 (202-566-2673 for TDD Relay). These are not toll-free numbers.

Issued this 22nd day of January, 1997 at Washington, D.C.

Mary Lu Jordan,

Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

[FR Doc. 97-1945 Filed 1-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6735-01-P-M

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Air Force

#### 32 CFR Part 806b

[Air Force Reg. 12-35]

#### Air Force Privacy Act Program

**AGENCY:** Department of the Air Force, DOD.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Air Force proposes to amend its Privacy Act regulations to add an exemption for a system of records identified as F111 AF JA B, Courts-Martial and Article 15 Records.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before March 31, 1997, to be considered by this agency.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to the Air Force Access Programs Manager, HQ USAF/SCMI, 1250 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330-1250.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Anne Rollins at (703) 697-8674 or DSN 227-8674.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Executive Order 12866. It has been determined that this Privacy Act proposed rule for the Department of Defense does not constitute 'significant regulatory action'. Analysis of the rule indicates that it does not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; does not create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; does not materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; does not raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in Executive Order 12866. Regulatory Flexibility Act. It has been determined that this Privacy Act proposed rule for the Department of Defense does not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because it is concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the Department of Defense. Paperwork Reduction Act. It has been determined that this Privacy Act

proposed rule for the Department of Defense imposes no information requirements beyond the Department of Defense and that the information collected within the Department of Defense is necessary and consistent with 5 U.S.C. 552a, known as the Privacy Act, and 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35.

List of subjects in 32 CFR part 806b Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 806b is proposed to be amended as follows:

#### PART 806b - AIR FORCE PRIVACY ACT PROGRAM

1. The authority citation for 32 CFR Part 806b continues to read as follows:  
Authority: Pub. L. 93-579, 88 Stat 1896 (5 U.S.C. 552a).

2. Appendix C to Part 806b is proposed to be amended by adding paragraph (b)(20) as follows:

#### Appendix C to Part 806b-General and specific exemptions.

\* \* \* \* \*

b. *Specific exemptions.* \* \* \*

(20) *System identifier and name:* F111 AF JA B, Courts-Martial and Article 15 Records.

(i) *Exemption.* Portions of this system of records may be exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2) from the following subsection of 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3), (c)(4), (d), (e)(1), (e)(2), (e)(3), (e)(4)(G), (H) and (I), (e)(5), (e)(8), (f), and (g).

(ii) *Exemption.* Portions of this system of records may be exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2) from the following subsection of 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3), (d), (e)(1), (e)(4)(G), (H) and (I), and (f).

(iii) *Authority:* 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2) and (k)(2).

(iv) *Reason:* (1) From subsection (c)(3) because the release of the disclosure accounting, for disclosures pursuant to the routine uses published for this system, would permit the subject of a criminal investigation or matter under investigation to obtain valuable information concerning the nature of that investigation which will present a serious impediment to law enforcement.

(2) From subsection (c)(4) because an exemption is being claimed for subsection (d), this subsection will not be applicable.

(3) From subsection (d) because access to the records contained in this system would inform the subject of a criminal investigation of the existence of that investigation, provide the subject of the investigation with information that might enable him to avoid detection or apprehension, and would present a serious impediment to law enforcement.