

record will be provided to the requester within 20 working days, unless final action regarding approval or denial will constitute acknowledgement.

* * * * *

3. Section 312.12, paragraph (b) is revised and paragraph (i) is added to read as follows:

§ 312.12 Exemptions.

* * * * *

(b) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense claims an exemption for the following record systems under the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a(j) and (k)(1)–(k)(7) from certain indicated subsections of the Privacy Act of 1974. The exemptions may be invoked and exercised on a case-by-case basis by the Deputy Inspector General for Investigations or the Director, Communications and Congressional Liaison Office, and the Chief, Freedom of Information/Privacy Act Office which serve as the Systems Program Managers. Exemptions will be exercised only when necessary for a specific, significant and legitimate reason connected with the purpose of the records system.

* * * * *

(i) *System Identifier*: CIG–21.

(1) *System name*: Congressional Correspondence Tracking System.

(2) *Exemption*: During the processing of a Congressional inquiry, exempt materials from other systems of records may in turn become part of the case record in this system. To the extent that copies of exempt records from those “other” systems of records are entered into this system, the Inspector General, DoD, claims the same exemptions for the records from those “other” systems that are entered into this system, as claimed for the original primary system of which they are a part.

(3) *Authority*: 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), (k)(1), (k)(2), (k)(3), (k)(4), (k)(5), (k)(6), and (k)(7).

(4) *Reasons*: Records are only exempt from pertinent provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a to the extent such provisions have been identified and an exemption claimed for the original record and the purposes underlying the exemption for the original record still pertain to the record which is now contained in this system of records. In general, the exemptions were claimed in order to protect properly classified information relating to national defense and foreign policy, to avoid interference during the conduct of criminal, civil, or administrative actions or investigations, to ensure protective services provided the President and others are not compromised, to protect the identity of confidential sources incident to Federal

employment, military service, contract, and security clearance determinations, to preserve the confidentiality and integrity of Federal testing materials, and to safeguard evaluation materials used for military promotions when furnished by a confidential source. The exemption rule for the original records will identify the specific reasons why the records are exempt from specific provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a.

Dated: November 20, 2003.

Patricia L. Toppings,

Alternate OSD Federal Register, Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 03–30396 Filed 12–8–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

32 CFR Part 806b

[Air Force Instruction 37–132]

Privacy Act; Implementation

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force, DoD.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Air Force is proposing to add an exemption rule for the system of records F071 JTF A, entitled “Computer Network Crime Case System”. The (j)(2) and (k)(2) exemptions increase the value of the system of records for law enforcement purposes.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 9, 2004, to be considered by this agency.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the Air Force Privacy Act Officer, AF–CIO/P, 1155 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330–1155.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mrs. Anne Rollins at (703) 601–4043 or DSN 329–4043.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Executive Order 12866, “Regulatory Planning and Review”

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense are not significant rules. The rules do not (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy; a sector of the economy; productivity; competition; jobs; the environment; public health or safety; or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another Agency; (3) Materially alter the

budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs, or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive order.

Public Law 96–354, “Regulatory Flexibility Act” (5 U.S.C. Chapter 6)

It has been certified that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense do not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they are concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the Department of Defense.

Public Law 96–511, “Paperwork Reduction Act” (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)

It has been certified that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense impose 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 of 1974.

Section 202, Public Law 104–4, “Unfunded Mandates Reform Act”

It has been certified that the Privacy Act rulemaking for the Department of Defense does not involve a Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more and that such rulemaking will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

Executive Order 13132, “Federalism”

It has been certified that the Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense do not have federalism implications. The rules do not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 806b

Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 806b is proposed to be amended to read 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 amended by adding paragraph (a)(7) to read as follows:

Appendix C to Part 806b—General and Specific Exemptions

a. General exemptions. * * *

(7) *System identifier and name:* F071 JTF A, Computer Network Crime Case System.

(i) *Exemption:* (A) Parts of this system may be exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2) if the information is compiled and maintained by a component of the agency, which performs as its principle function any activity pertaining to the enforcement of criminal laws. Any portion of this system of records which falls within the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2) may be exempt from the following subsections 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).

(B) Investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes, other than material within the scope of subsection 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), may be exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2). However, if an individual is denied any right, privilege, or benefit for which he would otherwise be entitled by Federal law or for which he would otherwise be eligible, as a result of the maintenance of the information, the individual will be provided access to the information exempt to the extent that disclosure would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

Note: When claimed, this exemption allows limited protection of investigative reports maintained in a system of records used in personnel or administrative actions. Any portion of this system of records which falls within the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2) may be exempt from the following subsections of 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3), (d), (e)(1), (e)(4)(G), (H) and (I), and (f).

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

(iii) *Reasons:* (A) From subsection (c)(3) because the release of accounting of disclosure would inform a subject that he or she is under investigation. This information would provide considerable advantage to the subject in providing him or her with knowledge concerning the nature of the investigation and the coordinated investigative efforts and techniques employed by the cooperating agencies. This would greatly impede criminal law enforcement.

(B) From subsection (c)(4) and (d), because notification would alert a subject to the fact that an open investigation on that individual is taking place, and might weaken the on-going investigation, reveal investigative techniques, and place confidential informants in jeopardy.

(C) From subsection (e)(1) because the nature of the criminal and/or civil investigative function creates unique problems in prescribing a specific parameter in a particular case with respect to what information is relevant or necessary. Also, information may be received which may relate to a case under the investigative jurisdiction of another agency. The maintenance of this information may be necessary to provide leads for appropriate law enforcement purposes and to establish patterns of activity that may relate to the jurisdiction of other cooperating agencies.

(D) From subsection (e)(2) because collecting information to the fullest extent possible directly from the subject individual may or may not be practical in a criminal and/or civil investigation.

(E) From subsection (e)(3) because supplying an individual with a form containing a Privacy Act Statement would tend to inhibit cooperation by many individuals involved in a criminal and/or civil investigation. The effect would be somewhat adverse to established investigative methods and techniques.

(F) From subsections (e)(4)(G), (H), and (I) because this system of records is exempt from the access provisions of subsection (d).

(G) From subsection (e)(5) because the requirement that records be maintained with attention to accuracy, relevance, timeliness, and completeness would unfairly hamper the investigative process. It is the nature of law enforcement for investigations to uncover the commission of illegal acts at diverse stages. It is frequently impossible to determine initially what information is accurate, relevant, timely, and least of all complete. With the passage of time, seemingly irrelevant or untimely information may acquire new significance as further investigation brings new details to light.

(H) From subsection (e)(8) because the notice requirements of this provision could present a serious impediment to law enforcement by revealing investigative techniques, procedures, and existence of confidential investigations.

(I) From subsection (f) because the agency's rules are inapplicable to those portions of the system that are exempt and would place the burden on the agency of either confirming or denying the existence of a record pertaining to a requesting individual might in itself provide an answer to that individual relating to an on-going investigation. The conduct of a successful investigation leading to the indictment of a criminal offender precludes the applicability of established agency rules relating to verification of record, disclosure of the record to that individual, and record amendment procedures for this record system.

(J) From subsection (g) because this system of records should be exempt to the extent that the civil remedies relate to provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a from which this rule exempts the system.

Dated: November 20, 2003.

Patricia L. Toppings,
Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 03-30398 Filed 12-8-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MO 199-1199; FRL-7592-4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the state of Missouri pertaining to an update to a St. Louis city SIP-approved ordinance, and permit. The effect of this action is to ensure that the SIP is current and consistent with the revised St. Louis city ordinance and permit and are thus Federally enforceable.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by January 8, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted either by mail or electronically. Written comments should be mailed to Wayne Kaiser, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. Electronic comments should be sent either to kaiser.wayne@epa.gov or to <http://www.regulations.gov>, which is an alternative method for submitting electronic comments to EPA. To submit comments, please follow the detailed instructions described in "What action is EPA taking" in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne Kaiser at (913) 551-7603, or by e-mail at kaiser.wayne@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, 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 relevant adverse comments to this action. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this action. If EPA receives relevant 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 action. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in