

DATE: Submit any comments by June 13, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Address all comments to Patricia E. Neely, Program Analyst, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC, 20530 (Room 850, WCTR Building).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia E. Neely—202-616-0178.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the notice section of today's **Federal Register**, the Department of Justice provides a description of the "Law Enforcement Support Center (LESC) Database, JUSTICE/INS-023."

This order relates to individuals rather than small business entities. Nevertheless, pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601-612, it is hereby stated that the order will not have "a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities."

List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 16

Administrative Practices and Procedures, Courts, Freedom of Information Act, Government in the Sunshine Act, and the Privacy Act.

Dated: April 28, 1997.

Stephen R. Colgate,
Assistant Attorney General for
Administration.

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Attorney General by 5 U.S.C. 552a and delegated to me by Attorney General Order No. 793-78, it is proposed to amend part 16 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

1. The authority for part 16 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301, 552, 552a, 552b(g), 553; 18 U.S.C. 4203(a)(1); 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 534, 31 U.S.C. 3717, 9701.

2. It is proposed to amend 28 CFR 16.99 by adding paragraphs (i) and (j) to read follows:¹

§ 16.99 Exemption of the Immigration and Naturalization Service Systems-limited access.

* * * * *

(i) The Law Enforcement Support Center Database (LESC) (Justice/INS-023) system of records is exempt under the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a (j)(2) from subsections (c) (3) and (4); (d); (e) (1), (2), (5), (8) and (g); but only to the extent that this system contains records within the scope of subsection (j)(2), and to the extent that records in the system are subject to exemption

therefrom. In addition, this system of records is also exempt in part under the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a (k) (2) from subsections (c)(3); (d); (e)(1), but only to the extent that this system contains records within the scope of subsection (k)(2), and to the extent that records in the system are subject to exemption therefrom.

(j) The following justifications apply to the exemptions from particular subsections:

(1) From subsection (c)(3) for reasons stated in paragraph (h)(1) of this section.

(2) From subsection (c)(4) from reasons stated in paragraph (h)(2) of this section.

(3) From the access and amendment provisions of subsection (d) because access to the records contained in this system of records could inform the subject of a criminal or civil investigation of the existence of that investigation; of the nature and scope of the information and evidence obtained as to their activities; and of information that may enable the subject to avoid detection or apprehension. Such disclosures would present a serious impediment to effective law enforcement where they prevent the successful completion of the investigation or other law enforcement operation such as deportation or exclusion. In addition, granting access to these records could result in a disclosure that would constitute an unwarranted invasion of the privacy third parties. Amendment of the records would interfere with ongoing investigations and law enforcement activities and impose an impossible administrative burden by requiring investigations to be continuously reinvestigated.

(4) From subsection (e)(1) for reasons stated in paragraph (h)(4) of this section.

(5) From subsection (e)(2) for reasons stated in paragraph (h)(5) of this section.

(6) From subsection (e)(3) because the requirement that individuals supplying information be provided with a form stating the requirements of subsection (e)(3) would constitute a serious impediment to criminal law enforcement in that it could compromise the existence of a confidential investigation.

(7) From subsection (e)(5) for reasons stated in paragraph (h)(7) of this section.

(8) From subsection (e)(8) for reasons stated in paragraph (h)(8) of this section.

(9) From subsection (g) to the extent that this system is exempt from the access and amendment provisions of subsection (d).

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[OK-13-1-7080b; FRL-5822-4]

State of Oklahoma; Approval of State Implementation Plan (SIP) Revision; Oklahoma Cotton Gin Emissions Control SIP Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This action proposes to approve the SIP revisions submitted by the State of Oklahoma on May 16, 1994, to satisfy the Federal Clean Air Act requirements of section 110. The May 16, 1994, submittal adopts opacity rules for cotton gin operations in Oklahoma to control particulate matter and visible emissions. In the Rules and Regulation section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the State's request as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the EPA views this action as noncontroversial and anticipates no adverse comments. The rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If the EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received on or before June 13, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to Thomas H. Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), Environmental Protection Agency Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733. Copies of the State's petition and other information relevant to this action are available for inspection during normal hours at the above location and at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency,
Region 6, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200,
Dallas, TX 75202-2733.
Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division, 4545 N. Lincoln, Suite 250, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105-5220.

Anyone wishing to review this petition at the EPA office is asked to

¹ Proposed paragraphs (g) and (h) were published in the **Federal Register** on March 7, 1997 (62 FR 10495).

contact the person below to schedule an appointment 24 hours in advance.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Petra Sanchez, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, telephone (214) 665-6686.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, see the direct final rule published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: April 24, 1997.

Jerry Clifford,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97-12552 Filed 5-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MO-023-1023(b); FRL-5823-1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the state of Missouri for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the EPA's general conformity rule. In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. An explanation for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If the EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by June 13, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Christopher D. Hess, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and

Development Branch, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher D. Hess at (913) 551-7213.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: April 9, 1997.

Michael Sanderson,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97-12554 Filed 5-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 12-2-0039; FRL-5825-8]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution District and South Coast Air Quality Management District State Implementation Plan Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) which concern the control of volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from facilities that load organic liquids into tank trucks, trailers, or railroad tank cars and the control of emissions during the transfer of organic liquids between storage units and delivery vessels.

The intended effect of proposing limited approval and limited disapproval of these rules is to regulate emissions of VOCs in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). EPA's final action on this proposed rulemaking document will incorporate these rules into the federally approved SIP. EPA has evaluated the rules and is proposing a simultaneous limited approval and limited disapproval under provisions of the CAA regarding EPA action on SIP submittals and general rulemaking authority because these revisions, while strengthening the SIP, also do not fully meet the CAA provisions regarding plan submissions and requirements for nonattainment areas.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 13, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to: Christine Vineyard, Rulemaking

Office [AIR-4], Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Copies of the rules and EPA's evaluation report of the rules are available for public inspection at EPA's Region 9 office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rules are also available for inspection at the following locations:

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95812.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1999 Tuolumne Street, Fresno, CA 93721.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 21865 E. Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4182.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine Vineyard, Rulemaking Office, [AIR-4], Air Division, U.S.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901, Telephone: (415) 744-1197.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Applicability

The rules being proposed for approval into the California SIP include: San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) Rule 463.3, Organic Liquid Loading, and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 462, Organic Liquid Loading. These rules were submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to EPA on January 28, 1992 and October 13, 1995, respectively.

II. Background

On March 3, 1978, EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the provisions of the 1977 Clean Air Act (1977 CAA or pre-amended Act), that included the Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin (LA Basin) and the San Joaquin Area that encompassed the following eight air pollution control districts (APCDs): Fresno County APCD, Kern County APCD,¹ King County APCD, Madera County APCD, Merced County APCD, San Joaquin County APCD, Stanislaus County APCD, and Tulare County APCD. 43 FR 8964; 40 CFR 81.305. The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin which includes all the above eight

¹ At that time, Kern County included portions of two-air basins: The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin and the Southeast Desert Air Basin. The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin portion of Kern County was designated as nonattainment, and the Southeast Desert Air Basin portion of Kern County was designated as unclassified, see 40 CFR 81.305 (1991).