

**DATES:** Applications should be received not later than November 13, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Send applications to: United States Sentencing Commission, One Columbus Circle, N.E., Suite 2-500, South Lobby, Washington, DC 20002-8002, Attention: Public Affairs-Victims Advisory Group Application.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael Courlander, Public Affairs Officer, Telephone: (202) 502-4590.

**Authority:** USSC Rules of Practice and Procedure 5.4.

**Ricardo H. Hinojosa,**  
*Chair.*

[FR Doc. E7-17798 Filed 9-10-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 2211-01-P**

## UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

### Sentencing Guidelines for United States Courts

**AGENCY:** United States Sentencing Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of final priorities.

**SUMMARY:** In July 2007, the Commission published a notice of possible policy priorities for the amendment cycle ending May 1, 2008. See 72 FR 41795 (July 31, 2007). After reviewing public comment received pursuant to the notice of proposed priorities, the Commission has identified its policy priorities for the upcoming amendment cycle and hereby gives notice of these policy priorities.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael Courlander, Public Affairs Officer, Telephone: (202) 502-4590.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United States Sentencing Commission is an independent agency in the judicial branch of the United States Government. The Commission promulgates sentencing guidelines and policy statements for federal sentencing courts pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(a). The Commission also periodically reviews and revises previously promulgated guidelines pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(o) and submits guideline amendments to the Congress not later than the first day of May each year pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(p).

As part of its statutory authority and responsibility to analyze sentencing issues, including operation of the federal sentencing guidelines, the Commission has identified its policy priorities for the amendment cycle ending May 1, 2008, and possibly continuing into the amendment cycle ending May 1, 2009. The Commission recognizes, however, that other factors,

such as the enactment of any legislation requiring Commission action, may affect the Commission's ability to complete work on any or all of its identified priorities by the statutory deadline of May 1, 2008. Accordingly, it may be necessary to continue work on any or all of these issues beyond the amendment cycle ending on May 1, 2008.

As so prefaced, the Commission has identified the following priorities:

(1) Implementation of crime legislation enacted during the 110th Congress warranting a Commission response, including (A) the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007, Public Law 110-22; and (B) any other legislation authorizing statutory penalties or creating new offenses that requires incorporation into the guidelines;

(2) Continuation of its work with Congress and other interested parties on cocaine sentencing policy to implement the recommendations set forth in the Commission's 2002 and 2007 reports to Congress, both entitled *Cocaine and Federal Sentencing Policy*, and to develop appropriate guideline amendments in response to any related legislation;

(3) Continuation of its work with the congressional, executive, and judicial branches of the government and other interested parties on appropriate responses to *United States v. Booker* and *United States v. Rita*, including any appropriate amendments to the guidelines or other changes to the *Guidelines Manual* with respect to those decisions and other cases that may be adjudicated during this amendment cycle, as well as continuation of its monitoring and analysis of post-*Booker* federal sentencing practices, data, case law, and other feedback, including reasons for departures and variances stated by sentencing courts;

(4) Continuation of its policy work regarding immigration offenses, specifically, offenses sentenced under §§ 2L1.1 (Smuggling, Transporting, or Harboring an Unlawful Alien) and 2L1.2 (Unlawfully Entering or Remaining in the United States) and implementation of any immigration legislation that may be enacted;

(5) Continuation of its policy work, in light of the Commission's prior and ongoing research on criminal history, to develop and consider possible options that might improve the operation of Chapter Four (Criminal History).

(6) Continuation of guideline simplification efforts with consideration and possible development of options for guideline amendments that might improve the operation of the sentencing guidelines;

(7) Resolution of a number of circuit conflicts, pursuant to the Commission's continuing authority and responsibility, under 28 U.S.C. 991(b)(1)(B) and *Braxton v. United States*, 500 U.S. 344 (1991), to resolve conflicting interpretations of the guidelines by the federal courts;

(8) Consideration of a limited number of miscellaneous guideline application issues, including issues concerning the determination of harm and the definition of "victim" in certain types of cases; the treatment under the guidelines of counterfeit controlled substances, human growth hormone (HGH), Prescription Drug Marketing Act of 1987 (Pub. L. 100-293) offenses, and other food and drug violations; specific concerns regarding application of the Chapter Three enhancements for abuse of trust and obstruction; and other miscellaneous priority issues coming to the Commission's attention; and

(9) Preparation and dissemination, pursuant to the Commission's authority under 28 U.S.C. 995(a)(12)-(16), of research reports on various aspects of federal sentencing policy and practice, such as updating the Commission's 1991 report to Congress entitled *Mandatory Minimum Penalties in the Federal Criminal Justice System* and studying alternatives to incarceration, including information on and possible development of any guideline amendments that might be appropriate in response to any research reports.

**AUTHORITY:** 28 U.S.C. 994(a), (o); USSC Rules of Practice and Procedure 5.2.

**Ricardo H. Hinojosa,**  
*Chair.*

[FR Doc. E7-17799 Filed 9-10-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 2211-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 5932]

### Reinstatement of Statutory Debarment Under the International Traffic in Arms Regulations

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Department of State has lifted the statutory debarment against Equipment & Supply, Inc. (ESI) pursuant to Section 38 (g)(4) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) (22 U.S.C. 2778).

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* Effective July 30, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Trimble, Director, Office of Defense Trade Controls Compliance, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State (202) 663-2477.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA (22 U.S.C. 2778) and Section 127.11 of the ITAR prohibit the issuance of export licenses or other approvals to a person, or any party to the export, who has been convicted of violating the AECA and certain other U.S. criminal statutes enumerated at Section 38(g)(1)(A) of the AECA and Section 120.27 of the ITAR. A person convicted of violating the AECA is also subject to statutory debarment under Section 127.7 of the ITAR.

In August 2004, ESI was convicted of one count of violating Section 38 of the AECA and the ITAR. Mr. Andrew Adams, then president of ESI, separately pled guilty to one count of violating 18 U.S.C. Section 1361 by attempting to commit depredation against property manufactured for the United States. Count one of Mr. Adams' indictment (02-CR-262) alleges that he attempted to export a defense article specifically designed or modified for use in the S-65 Sikorsky military helicopter. Subsequently, the Department of State statutorily debarred ESI (see 70 FR 189, September 30, 2005). Because Mr. Adams is affiliated with the debarred entity, the presumption of denial for licenses or other State authorizations was applied to him as well.

Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA permits termination of debarment after consultation with the other appropriate U.S. agencies and after a thorough review of the circumstances surrounding the conviction and a finding that appropriate steps have been taken to mitigate any law enforcement concerns. The Department of State has determined that ESI has taken appropriate steps to address the causes of the violations and to mitigate any law enforcement concerns. Therefore, in accordance with Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA, the debarment against ESI was rescinded, effective July 30, 2007. The presumption of denial for licenses or other State authorizations applied to Mr. Adams has also been lifted. The effect of this notice is that ESI and Mr. Adams may participate without prejudice in the export of defense articles and defense services subject to Section 38 of the AECA and the ITAR.

Dated: August 22, 2007.

**Stephen D. Mull,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs Department of State.*

[FR Doc. E7-17902 Filed 9-10-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710-25-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 5931]

### Bureau of Political-Military Affairs; Statutory Debarment Under the Arms Export Control Act and the International Traffic in Arms Regulations

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Department of State has imposed statutory debarment pursuant to § 127.7(c) of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations ("ITAR") (22 CFR Parts 120 to 130) on persons convicted of violating or conspiring to violate Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, ("AECA") (22 U.S.C. 2778).

**DATES: Effective Date:** Date of conviction as specified for each person.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Trimble, Director, Office of Defense Trade Controls Compliance, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State (202) 663-2980.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA, 22 U.S.C. 2778(g)(4), prohibits the Department of State from issuing licenses or other approvals for the export of defense articles or defense services where the applicant, or any party to the export, has been convicted of violating certain statutes, including the AECA. In implementing this provision, Section 127.7 of the ITAR provides for "statutory debarment" of any person who has been convicted of violating or conspiring to violate the AECA. Persons subject to statutory debarment are prohibited from participating directly or indirectly in the export of defense articles, including technical data, or in the furnishing of defense services for which a license or other approval is required.

Statutory debarment is based solely upon conviction in a criminal proceeding, conducted by a United States Court, and as such the administrative debarment procedures outlined in Part 128 of the ITAR are not applicable.

The period for debarment will be determined by the Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs based on the underlying nature of the violations, but will generally be for three years from the date of conviction. At the end of the debarment period, export privileges may be reinstated only at the request of the debarred person followed by the necessary interagency consultations, after a thorough review of the circumstances surrounding the

conviction, and a finding that appropriate steps have been taken to mitigate any law enforcement concerns, as required by Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA. Unless export privileges are reinstated, however, the person remains debarred.

Department of State policy permits debarred persons to apply to the Director, Office of Defense Trade Controls Compliance, for reinstatement beginning one year after the date of the debarment. Any decision to grant reinstatement can be made only after the statutory requirements under Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA have been satisfied.

Exceptions, also known as transaction exceptions, may be made to this debarment determination on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of the Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, after consulting with the appropriate U.S. agencies. However, such an exception would be granted only after a full review of all circumstances, paying particular attention to the following factors: Whether an exception is warranted by overriding U.S. foreign policy or national security interests; whether an exception would further law enforcement concerns that are consistent with the foreign policy or national security interests of the United States; or whether other compelling circumstances exist that are consistent with the foreign policy or national security interests of the United States, and that do not conflict with law enforcement concerns. Even if exceptions are granted, the debarment continues until subsequent reinstatement.

Pursuant to Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA and Section 127.7(c) of the ITAR, the following persons are statutorily debarred as of the date of their AECA conviction:

(1) Leib Kohn, May 22, 2007, U.S. District Court, District of Connecticut, Case # 3:04CR125.

(2) Electro-Glass Products, July 13, 2007, U.S. District Court, District of Pennsylvania, Case# 06-00117-001.

As noted above, at the end of the three-year period following the date of conviction, the above named persons/entities remain debarred unless export privileges are reinstated.

Debarred persons are generally ineligible to participate in activity regulated under the ITAR (see e.g., sections 120.1(c) and (d), and 127.11(a)). Also, under Section 127.1(c) of the ITAR, any person who has knowledge that another person is subject to debarment or is otherwise ineligible may not, without disclosure to and