

(12) *Inspector General Records (F120 AF IG B).*

(i) *Exemption.* This system is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3); (d); (e)(4) (G), (H), and (I); and (f). However, if a person is denied any right, privilege, or benefit, he or she would otherwise be entitled to as a result of keeping this material, it must be released, unless doing so would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

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

(iii) *Reasons.* Granting individuals access to information collected while an Inspector General inquiry is in progress could interfere with the just, thorough, and timely resolution of the complaint or inquiry and could possibly enable individuals to conceal wrong doing or mislead the inquiring officer. Disclosure might also subject sources, witnesses, and their families to harassment or intimidation.

(13) *Investigative Applicant Processing Records (F124 AFOSI B).*

(i) *Exemption.* This system is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3); (d); (e)(4) (G), (H), and (I); and (f), but only to the extent that disclosure would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

(ii) *Authority.* 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5).

(iii) *Reasons.* To protect those who gave information in confidence during Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) applicant inquiries. Fear of harassment could cause sources not to make frank and open responses about applicant qualifications. This could compromise the integrity of the AFOSI personnel program that relies on selecting only qualified people.

(14) *Master Cadet Personnel Record (Active/Historical) (F035 AFB B).*

(i) *Exemptions.* Parts of these systems are exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(d), (e)(4)(H), and (f), but only to the extent that they would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

(ii) *Authority.* 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(7).

(iii) *Reasons.* To maintain the candor and integrity of comments needed to evaluate a cadet for commissioning in the Air Force.

(15) *Sensitive Compartmented Information Personnel Records (F205 AFIS A).*

(i) *Exemption.* This system is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(a)(3); (d); (e)(4) (G), (H), and (I); and (f), but only to the extent that disclosure would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

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

(iii) *Reasons.* To protect the identity of sources to whom proper promises of confidentiality have been made during investigations. Without these promises, sources will often be unwilling to provide information essential in adjudicating access in a fair and impartial manner.

(16) *Security and Related Investigative Records (F124 AFB).*

(i) *Exemption.* This system is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3); (d); (e)(4) (G), (H), and (I); and (f), but only to the extent that disclosure would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

(ii) *Authority.* 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5).

(iii) *Reasons.* To protect the identity of those who give information in confidence for personnel security and related investigations. Fear of harassment could cause sources to refuse to give this information in the frank and open way needed to pinpoint those areas in an investigation that should be expanded to resolve charges of questionable conduct.

(17) *Special Security Case Files (F205 AFSCO A).*

(i) *Exemption.* This system is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3); (d); (e)(4) (G), (H), and (I); and (f), but only to the extent that disclosure would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

(ii) *Authority.* 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5).

(iii) *Reasons.* To protect the identity of those who give information in confidence for personnel security and related investigations. Fear of harassment could cause sources to refuse to give this information in the frank and open way needed to pinpoint those areas in an investigation that should be expanded to resolve charges of questionable conduct.

(18) *Special Security Files (F205 AF SP A).*

(i) *Exemption.* This system is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3); (d); (e)(4) (G), (H), and (I); and (f), but only to the extent that disclosure would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

(ii) *Authority.* 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5).

(iii) *Reasons.* To protect the identity of those who give information in confidence for personnel security and related investigations. Fear of harassment could cause them to refuse to give this information in the frank and open way needed to pinpoint areas in an investigation that should be expanded to resolve charges of questionable conduct.

Patsy J. Conner,

Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 86-12519 Filed 6-3-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3910-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[FRL-3025-3]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Final rulemaking.

SUMMARY: USEPA is approving a site-specific revision to the Illinois State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Carbon Monoxide (CO). This final rulemaking incorporates a January 24, 1985, Opinion and Order of the Illinois Pollution Control Board (PCB), PCB 84-147, into the SIP. This order grants Anderson Clayton Foods, Inc. (ACF) a variance from 35 Illinois Administrative Code 216.121, which governs CO emissions from the Fluidized Bed Combustor (FBC) retrofitted boiler at ACF's Jacksonville, Illinois, facility. This action is taken in response to a March 27, 1985, request from the State of Illinois.

USEPA proposed to approve this site-specific SIP revision on November 15, 1985 (50 FR 47234). No public comments were received on the proposed approval.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rulemaking becomes effective on July 7, 1986.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the SIP revision and other materials relating to this rulemaking are available at the following addresses for review: (it is recommended that you telephone Uylaine E. McMahan, at (312) 886-6031, before visiting the Region V Office.)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (5AR-26), Region V, Air and Radiation Branch, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604

Environmental Protection Agency, Public Information Reference Unit, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Air Pollution Control, 2200 Churchill Road, Springfield, Illinois 62706

Copies of this revision to the Illinois SIP are available for inspection at: The Office of the Federal Register, 1100 L Street, NW., Room 8401, Washington, DC

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Uylaine E. McMahan, Regulatory Analysis Section, Air and Radiation Branch (5AR-26), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 27, 1985, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency,

(IEPA) submitted a variance from 35 Illinois Administrative Code 216.121¹ for a FBC retrofitted boiler at ACF's facility in Jacksonville, Illinois, as a final revision to its CO SIP. Jacksonville is located in an area that is classified as attainment with respect to the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for CO.

The variance will allow the existing boiler, that will be retrofitted with FBC, to emit up to 400 parts per million (ppm) of CO, until January 24, 1988. Because the FBC boiler is a major new source in an attainment area, it must meet the best available control technology (BACT) requirement of the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) regulations. Under the existing federally approved CO SIP, a new source is required to meet a limit of 200 ppm. In today's rulemaking, USEPA's final finding is limited to determining that the CO NAAQS will not be violated by this variance. In this notice, USEPA makes no finding regarding the 400 ppm emission limit in relation to the BACT requirement.

The IPCB granted ACF a variance from 35 Illinois Administrative Code 216.121 which allows a temporary CO limit of 400 ppm until January 23, 1988. ACF's FCC boiler, is subject to the following operating conditions:

1. CO emissions during the period of the variance must be kept to a level below 400 parts per million.
2. ACF is required to develop and implement a program to study and evaluate any technical advances in the control of CO in fluidized bed combusters.
3. ACF is required to develop and evaluate the operation characteristics of their fluidized bed combustor.

4. ACF is required to submit to IEPA every 6 months, a written report describing the progress of the programs required by conditions 3, 4 and 5.

5. Within 45 days of the date of this Order, ACF shall execute a Certificate of Acceptance and Agreement to be bound to all terms and conditions of this variance.

USEPA reviewed the air quality analysis section of ACF's preconstruction permit application that was completed as part of the PSD requirements. The details of this analysis are contained in the March 27, 1985, State submittal. The predicted CO

impact is well below the maximum 1-hour and 8-hour secondary NAAQS.

ACF's retrofitted FBC boiler will not have a significant impact on CO air quality in Jacksonville and, therefore, will not interfere with attainment and maintenance of the CO NAAQS. USEPA proposed to approve this site-specific SIP revision on November 15, 1985 (50 FR 47234). No public comments were received to the proposed approval. USEPA is, therefore, approving PCB 84-147 as revision to the Illinois CO SIP.

However, USEPA is not affirming the 400 ppm emission limit for CO as BACT for FBC boilers. The final approval of this SIP revision does not in any way eliminate the requirements for ACF to comply with the PSD regulations or any other applicable new source regulation.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

Petitions for judicial review of this action under section 307(b)(1) of the Act must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate Circuit by August 4, 1986. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (See section 307(b)(2) of the Act).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Incorporation by Reference, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Intergovernmental relations.

Dated: May 27, 1986.

Lee M. Thomas,
Administrator.

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Illinois—Subpart O

Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter I, Part 52, is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7642.

2. Section 52.720 is amended by adding new paragraph (c)(66) as follows:

§ 52.720 Identification of Plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(66) On March 27, 1985, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) submitted a site-specific revision to its Carbon Monoxide State Implementation Plan for Anderson Clayton Foods, Inc. (ACF), a variance from 35 Illinois Administrative Code (IAC) 216.121 which governs Carbon Monoxide emissions from the Fluidized

Bed Combustor retrofitted boiler at ACF's Jacksonville, Illinois facility. IAC 216.121 was incorporated in the Illinois SIP on May 31, 1972 (37 FR 10862), as Illinois Pollution Control Board Rule 206(a).

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Illinois Pollution Control Board Opinion and Order of the Board, PCB 84-147, which was adopted on January 24, 1985.

[FR Doc. 86-12437 Filed 6-3-86; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[FRL-3025-4]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Oregon

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: By this Notice, EPA approves the redesignation of the Medford-Ashland, Oregon "nonattainment" area to "attainment" for the primary ozone (O₃) standard and approves an air quality maintenance strategy as a revision to the Oregon State Implementation Plan (SIP). The redesignation request is based on supporting documentation prepared and submitted by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) pursuant to section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act. Air quality data and emission reductions achieved through implementation of control strategy measures support this redesignation.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 4, 1986.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the materials submitted to EPA may be examined during normal business hours at: Public Information, Reference Unit, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20460. Air Programs Branch (10A-85-8), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101. State of Oregon, Department of Environmental Quality, Yeon Building, 522 SW Fifth, Portland, OR 97204. Office of the Federal Register, Room 8401, 1100 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard F. White, Air Programs Branch, M/S 532, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101, Telephone No. (206) 442-4232, (FTS) 399-4232.

¹ IAC 216.121 was incorporated in the Illinois SIP as Illinois Pollution Control Board Rule 206(a) on May 31, 1972 (37 FR 10862). This Rule was subsequently recodified as part of the Illinois Administrative Code. In a subsequent Federal Register notice, USEPA will propose to incorporate the recodification of the SIP.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On March 3, 1978 (43 FR 8962), EPA designated, pursuant to the requirements of section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act, all areas of the country as "attainment," "nonattainment," or "unclassifiable" in terms of meeting National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). At that time, the Medford-Ashland, AQMA, encompassing a portion of Jackson County, Oregon, was designated "nonattainment" for primary O₃ standards in 40 CFR Part 81, § 81.338.

EPA approved, with conditions, the Medford-Ashland, O₃ SIP on June 24, 1980 (45 FR 42285). These conditions were satisfied by ODEQ and removed by EPA on November 5, 1981 (46 FR 54939). On March 11, 1982 (47 FR 10534), EPA approved additional revisions to the O₃ SIP.

ODEQ held a public hearing in Medford, Oregon, on December 4, 1984, to obtain public comment on the redesignation proposal. The proposal was then adopted by the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission on January 25, 1985. ODEQ submitted the redesignation request to EPA on February 28, 1985. The submittal included documentation of attainment for the O₃ standard based on both emission reductions, air quality improvement, and O₃ and precursor modeling.

On January 24, 1986 (51 FR 3219), EPA published a proposed rulemaking for approval of the redesignation request and the attendant plan to maintain the O₃ standard in the Medford-Ashland AQMA. The proposal contained a technical evaluation of the attainment and maintenance demonstrations, covering air quality data, emission reductions, VOC regulations, emission projections, and the use of a growth cushion, which will eliminate the necessity of case-by-case air quality analyses for new or modified major stationary sources subject to the ODEQ PSD rules.

No comments were received during the 30-day public comment period, which ended on February 24, 1986.

II. EPA Final Action

EPA is redesignating the Medford-Ashland, Oregon, O₃ nonattainment area to attainment for the primary O₃ standard and is approving the O₃ maintenance plan.

Under 5 U.S.C. 605(b), I certify that this SIP approval will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. (See 46 FR 8709.)

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this

action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by 60 days from today. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (See 307(b)(2)).

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Ozone, Sulfur oxides, Nitrogen dioxide, Lead, Particulate matter, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and record-keeping requirements.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 81

Air pollution control, National parks and wilderness areas.

Dated: May 28, 1986.

Lee M. Thomas,
Administrator.

Note.—Incorporation by reference of the State Implementation Plan for the State of Oregon was approved by the Director of the Office of Federal Register on July 1, 1982.

PART 52—[AMENDED]

Part 52 of Chapter I, Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

Subpart MM—Oregon

1. The authority citation for Part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7642.

2. Section 52.1970 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(77) as follows:

§ 52.1970 Identification of Plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(77) On February 28, 1985, the Director of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality submitted (1) a request to EPA to redesignate the Medford-Ashland Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA) from nonattainment to attainment for the primary O₃ standard and (2) a plan to maintain that standard.

(i) Incorporation by reference:

(A) Letter of February 28, 1985, from Oregon State Department of Environmental Quality to EPA Region 10.

(B) Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 340, Division 20, Section 4.8 "Medford-Ashland Air Quality Maintenance Area Plan for Maintenance of Ozone Standard," adopted by the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission on January 25, 1985.

PART 81—[AMENDED]

Part 81 of Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

Subpart C—Section 107 Attainment Status Designations

1. The authority citation for Part 81 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 407(d), 7501(2) and 7601(a).

2. In § 81.338 the attainment status designation table for ozone is revised to read as follows:

§ 81.338 Ozone.

OREGON—OZONE

Designated area	Does not meet primary standard	Cannot be classified as or is better than national standard
Portland-Vancouver AQMA (Oregon portion)	X	
Medford-Ashland AQMA		X
Salem	X	
Eugene-Springfield AQMA		X
Remainder of State		X

[FR Doc. 86-12441 Filed 6-3-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 60

[AD-FRL-3008-6]

Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources; Addition of Alternative Procedure to Method 1 of Appendix A; Measurement Location

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: An alternative, site location procedure addition to Method 1 was proposed in the Federal Register on May 10, 1985 (50 FR 19725). This action promulgates the addition of this alternative procedure. The alternative procedure applies to the determination of the acceptability of measurement locations that do not meet minimum criteria now in Method 1. The alternative is the application of a directional flow-sensing probe to determine pitch and yaw angles at a measurement location less than 2 equivalent diameters downstream or less than ½ an equivalent diameter upstream from a flow disturbance.

The intended effect of the addition of the alternative procedure is to allow the evaluation of the acceptability of measurement locations that do not otherwise meet the minimum criteria in Method 1. With the addition of the alternative procedure, source owners may choose to use an existing