

cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library. In requesting a copy of the Consent Decree without Attachments, please enclose a check in the amount of \$10.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

**Joel M. Gross,**

*Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section  
Environment and Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 00-1881 Filed 1-26-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 C.F.R. § 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed consent decree in the case of *United States v. Las Vegas Paving Corp.*, Civil Action No. CVS-00-0049-DWH-LRL (D. Nevada), was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Nevada on January 10, 2000.

The proposed consent decree resolves claims that the United States asserted against Las Vegas Paving Corp. (LVPC) in a civil complaint filed concurrently with the lodging of the consent decree. The complaint alleges that LVPC installed and operated five internal combustion engines at its Lone Mountain facility in Clark County, Nevada, in violation of permitting requirements of the Nevada State Implementation Plan for Clark County, and that LVPC installed and operated affected facilities at its Apex facility in Clark County, Nevada, and failed to comply with notification and performance test requirements of the New Source Performance Standards of 40 C.F.R. Part 60 Subparts A, I, and OOO.

The proposed consent decree requires defendant to pay a civil penalty of \$82,500. In addition, defendant is required to apply timing retardation to one engine and conduct a source test on that engine, apply for permits for two engines, and cease the operation of three engines unless it applies for permits.

The Department of Justice will accept comments relating to this consent decree for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication. Address your comments to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, and send a copy to the Environmental Enforcement Section, U.S. Department of Justice, 301 Howard Street, Suite 870, San Francisco, CA 94105. Your comments should refer to

*United States v. Las Vegas Paving Corp.*, Civil Action No. CVS-00-0049-DWH-LRL (D. Nevada), and DOJ No. 90-5-2-1-2220.

You may examine the proposed consent decree at the office of the United States Attorney, District of Nevada, 701 East Bridger Avenue, Suite 600, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101. You may also obtain a copy of the consent decree by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044. Your request for a copy of the consent decree should refer to *United States v. Las Vegas Paving Corp.*, Civil Action No. CVS-00-0049-DWH-LRL (D. Nevada), and DOJ No. 90-5-2-1-2220, and must include a check for \$4.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the "Consent Decree Library."

**Joel Gross,**

*Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,  
Environment and Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 00-1877 Filed 1-26-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decrees Pursuant to the Clean Water Act

Notice is hereby given that proposed consent decrees embodying settlements in *United States and State of California v. City of Los Angeles and City of Burbank, et al.*, Civ No. 77-3047-HP were lodged on December 30, 1999, with the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

The Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint filed jointly by the United States and the State of California alleged, among other things, that the cities of Los Angeles and Burbank had violated the pretreatment requirements established under section 307(b) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1317(b). Specifically, the complaint alleged that the cities failed to adequately implement their required pretreatment programs, in that they failed to ensure that industrial dischargers to the cities' treatment works complied with the discharge and monitoring requirements of the pretreatment regulations. The State pled parallel claims under the California Water Code. The complaint sought civil penalties and injunctive relief against the cities.

The proposed consent decree resolves the liability of the cities for the violations alleged in the complaint. Under the decree, Los Angeles will pay a civil penalty of \$236,000 and perform Supplemental Environmental Projects (water reclamation and low-flow storm

discharge diversion) projected to cost at least \$15 million. Burbank will pay a civil penalty of \$137,000 and perform a Supplemental Environmental Project (advanced secondary treatment upgrades) estimated to cost at least \$2.1 million.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the proposed consent decrees. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, and should refer to *United States and State of California v. City of Los Angeles and City of Burbank, et al.*, DOJ Ref. No. 90-5-1-1-809B.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney, Central District of California, Federal Building, Room 7516, 300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California 90012; and at the Region IX Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105. A copy of the Consent Decree may be also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611. In requesting a copy, please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$6.75 for the Los Angeles decree and \$6.00 for the Burbank decree (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

**Joel Gross,**

*Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,  
Environment and Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 00-1879 Filed 1-26-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to Resources Conservation and Recovery Act Sections 3008 and 7003 and Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1431

Notice is hereby given that on January 18, 2000, the United States lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico in the civil actions consolidated as *Albuquerque v. Sparton Technology, Inc.*, No. CV 97 0206. The proposed Consent Decree resolves civil claims in the consolidated actions including the action filed by the United States, *United States v. Sparton Technology, Inc.*, No. CV 97 0210 (D.N.M.), related to soil and groundwater contamination emanating from the Sparton Technology, Inc.

("Sparton") manufacturing facility on Coors Road in Albuquerque, NM ("the Facility"). In this action, the United States alleged claims pursuant to Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA") Sections 3008 and 7003, 42 U.S.C. §§ 6928 and 6973, and Safe Drinking Water Act ("SDWA") Section 1431, 42 U.S.C. § 300i. Under the proposed Consent Decree, Sparton will perform comprehensive corrective action to address groundwater and soil affected by contamination emanating from the Facility. Sparton will also pay a total of \$1.675 million consisting of a civil penalty of \$475,000 to be shared by the United States and the New Mexico Environment Department, a payment of natural resources damages of \$1 million to the State of New Mexico, and \$200,000 to the City of Albuquerque, the New Mexico Environment Department, and the New Mexico Attorney General's Office for litigation costs. The proposed Consent Decree also dismisses with prejudice *Sparton Technology, Inc. v. Environmental Protection Agency*, No. CV 97 0981 (D.N.M.)—one of the consolidated actions—and provides the United States a full release with respect to the agency actions challenged by Sparton in that case.

The Department of Justice will receive comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree for 30 days following publication of this Notice. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, United States Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *Albuquerque v. Sparton Technology, Inc.*, No. CV 97 0206 (D.N.M.), DOJ No. 90-7-1-875. The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney for the District of New Mexico, 200 3rd Street, NW., Ste 900, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102 and the Region VI Office of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202. A copy of the proposed Consent Decree may be obtained by mail from the Department of Justice Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044. When requesting a copy, please enclose a check for reproduction costs for the Consent Decree (at 25 cents per page) in the amount of \$153.75, payable to the "Consent Decree Library."

**Joel M. Gross,**

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,  
Environment and Natural Resources Division.  
[FR Doc. 00-1876 Filed 1-26-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

## DEPARTMENT OF OF JUSTICE

[AAG/A Order No. 190-2000]

### Privacy Act of 1974 as Amended by The Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988; Computer Matching Programs

This notice is published in the **Federal Register** in accordance with the requirements of the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a), as amended by the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988 (CMPPA) (Public Law 100-503) (5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(12)). The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), Department of Justice (the source agency), is participating in computer matching programs with the District of Columbia and seven State agencies (all designated as recipient agencies). These matching activities will permit the recipient agencies to confirm the immigration status of alien applicants for, or recipients of, Federal benefits assistance under the "Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE)" program as required by the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-603).<sup>1</sup>

Specifically, the matching activities will permit the following eligibility determinations:

(1) The District of Columbia Department of Employment Services, the New York State Department of Labor, the New Jersey Department of Labor, the Texas Workforce Commission and the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training will be able to determine eligibility for unemployment compensation;

(2) The California Department of Social Services will be able to determine eligibility status for the TANF program and the Food Stamps program;

(3) The California Department of Health Services will be able to determine eligibility status for the Medicaid program;

The Colorado Department of Human Services<sup>2</sup> will be able to determine the

<sup>1</sup>Effective July 1, 1997, IRCA was amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), Pub. L. 104-193, 110 Stat. 2168 (1996). The PRWORA amend IRCA by replacing the reference to "Aid to Families with Dependent Children" (AFDC), with a reference to its successor program, "Temporary Assistance for Needy Families" (TANF). As was the case with AFDC, states and the District of Columbia are required to verify through SAVE that an applicant or recipient is in an eligible alien status for TANF benefits. In addition, Section 840 of the PRWORA makes verification for eligibility under the Food Stamps Program voluntary on the part of the State/District of Columbia agency rather than mandatory.

<sup>2</sup>Identified in previous computer matching notices as the Colorado Department of Social Services.

eligibility status for the Medicaid, TANF, and Food Stamps programs.

Section 121(c) of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986 amends Section 1137 of the Social Security and other statutes to require agencies which administer the Federal entitlement benefits programs designated within IRCA as amended, to use the INS verifications system to determine eligibility. Accordingly, through the use of user identification codes and passwords, authorized persons from these agencies may electronically access the database of an INS system of records entitled "Alien Status Verification Index, Justice/INS-009". From its automated records system, any agency (named above) participating in these matching programs may enter electronically into the INS database the alien registration number of the applicant or recipient. This action will initiate a search of the INS database for a corresponding alien registration number. Where such number is located, the agency will receive electronically from the INS database the following data upon which to determine eligibility; alien registration number, last name, first name, date of birth, country of birth (not nationality), social security number (if available), date of entry, immigration status data, and employment eligibility data. In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(p), such agencies will provide the alien applicant with 30 days notice and an opportunity to contest any adverse finding before final action is taken against that alien because of ineligible immigration status as established through the computer match.

The original effective date of the matching programs (with the exception of the matching agreement with Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training) was January 29, 1990, for which notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 28, 1989 (54 FR 53382). The original effective date of the Massachusetts matching program was February 28, 1990, for which notice was published in the **Federal Register** on January 29, 1990 (55 FR 2890). The programs have continued to date under the authority of a series of new approvals as required by the CMPPA. The CMPPA provides that based upon approval by agency Data Integrity Boards of a new computer matching agreement, computer matching activities may be conducted for 18 months and, contingent upon specific conditions, may be similarly extended by the Board for an additional year without the necessity of a new agreement. The most recent one-year extension for those