

uncovered a problem, thereby preventing further violations. (GREAT WEIGHT)

3. The violation was an isolated occurrence or the result of a good-faith misinterpretation.

4. Based on the facts of a case and under the applicable licensing policy, required authorization for the export transaction in question would likely have been granted upon request.

5. Other than with respect to antiboycott matters under part 760:

a. The party has never been convicted of an export-related criminal violation;

b. In the past five years, the party has not entered into a settlement of an export-related administrative enforcement case with BIS or another U.S. Government agency or been found liable in an export-related administrative enforcement case brought by BIS or another U.S. Government agency;

c. In the past three years, the party has not received a warning letter from BIS; and

d. In the past five years, the party has not otherwise violated the EAR.

Where necessary to effective enforcement, the prior involvement in export violations of a party's owners, directors, officers, partners, or other related persons may be imputed to a party in determining whether these criteria are satisfied.

6. The party has cooperated to an exceptional degree with BIS efforts to investigate the party's conduct.

7. The party has provided substantial assistance in BIS investigation of another person who may have violated the EAR.

8. The violation was not likely to involve harm of the nature that the applicable provisions of the EAA, EAR or other authority (e.g., a license condition) were intended to protect against; for example, a false statement on an SED that an export was "NLR," when in fact a license requirement was applicable, but a license exception was available.

9. At the time of the violation, the party: (1) Had little or no previous export experience; and (2) was not familiar with export practices and requirements. (Note: The presence of only one of these elements will not generally be considered a mitigating factor.)

Aggravating Factors

1. The party made a deliberate effort to hide or conceal the violation(s). (GREAT WEIGHT)

2. The party's conduct demonstrated a serious disregard for export compliance responsibilities. (GREAT WEIGHT)

3. The violation was significant in view of the sensitivity of the items involved and/or the reason for controlling them to the destination in question. This factor would be present where the conduct in question, in purpose or effect, substantially implicated national security or other essential interests protected by the U.S. export control system, in view of such factors as the destination and sensitivity of the items involved. Such conduct might include, for example, violations of controls based on nuclear, biological, and chemical weapon proliferation, missile technology proliferation, and national security concerns, and exports proscribed in part 744. (GREAT WEIGHT)

4. The violation was likely to involve harm of the nature that the applicable provisions of the EAA, EAR or other authority (e.g., a license condition) are principally intended to protect against, e.g., a false statement on an SED that an export was destined for a non-embargoed country, when in fact it was destined for an embargoed country.

5. The quantity and/or value of the exports was high, such that a greater penalty may be necessary to serve as an adequate penalty for the violation or deterrence of future violations, or to make the penalty proportionate to those for otherwise comparable violations involving exports of lower quantity or value.

6. The presence in the same transaction of concurrent violations of laws and regulations, other than those enforced by BIS.

7. Other than with respect to antiboycott matters under part 760:

a. The party has been convicted of an export-related criminal violation;

b. In the past five years, the party has entered into a settlement of an export-related administrative enforcement case with BIS or another U.S. Government agency or has been found liable in an export-related administrative enforcement case brought by BIS or another U.S. Government agency;

c. In the past three years, the party has received a warning letter from BIS; or

d. In the past five years, the party otherwise violated the EAR. Where necessary to effective enforcement, the prior involvement in export violations of a party's owners, directors, officers, partners, or other related persons may be imputed to a party in determining whether these criteria are satisfied.

8. The party exports as a regular part of the party's business, but lacked a systematic export compliance effort.

In deciding whether and what scope of denial or exclusion order is appropriate, the following factors are particularly relevant: the presence of mitigating or aggravating factors of great weight; the degree of willfulness involved; in a business context, the extent to which senior management participated in or was aware of the conduct in question; the number of violations; the existence and seriousness of prior violations; the likelihood of future violations (taking into account relevant export compliance efforts); and whether a monetary penalty can be expected to have a sufficient deterrent effect.

IV. How BIS Makes Suspension and Deferral Decisions

A. *Civil Penalties*: In appropriate cases, payment of a civil monetary penalty may be deferred or suspended. See §764.3(a)(iii). In determining whether suspension or deferral is appropriate, BIS may consider, for example, whether the party has demonstrated a limited ability to pay a penalty that would be appropriate for such violations, so that suspended or deferred payment can be expected to have sufficient deterrent value, and whether, in light of all of the circumstances, such suspension or deferral is necessary to make the impact of the penalty consistent with the impact of BIS penalties on other parties who committed similar violations.

B. *Denial of Export Privileges and Exclusion from Practice*: In deciding whether a denial or exclusion order should be suspended, BIS may consider, for example, the adverse economic consequences of the order on the respondent, its employees, and other parties, as well as on the national interest in the competitiveness of U.S. businesses. An otherwise appropriate denial or exclusion order will be suspended on the basis of adverse economic consequences only if it is found that future export control violations are unlikely and if there are adequate measures (usually a substantial civil penalty) to achieve the necessary deterrent effect.

Dated: September 9, 2003.

Kenneth I. Juster,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security.

[FR Doc. 03-23499 Filed 9-16-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-33-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 30, 31, 33, 35 and 40

[Docket ID No. OA-2002-0001; FRL-7560-7]

RIN 2020-AA39

Public Hearings on Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in Procurement Under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Financial Assistance Agreements

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; public hearings.

SUMMARY: This document announces the dates and locations of public hearings wherein EPA will take comments on its proposed rule for "Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in Procurement under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Financial Assistance Agreements," published on July 24, 2003 at 68 FR 43824. These public hearings will be held during the 180-day public comment period for the proposed rule, which ends on January 20, 2004. EPA will publish information concerning additional public hearings during the comment period when that information becomes available.

EPA also will hold meetings with Tribal officials/representatives during the 180-day public comment period. EPA will publish information concerning such Tribal hearings when that information becomes available.

DATES: See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for hearing dates.

ADDRESSES: See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for addresses.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mark Gordon, Attorney Advisor, at (202) 564-5951, Kimberly Patrick, Attorney Advisor, at (202) 564-5386, or David Sutton, Deputy Director at (202) 564-4444, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 1230A, Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA published its proposed rule for Participation by Disadvantage Business Enterprises in Procurement under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Financial Assistance Agreements on July 24, 2003 at 68 FR 43824.

EPA has established an official public docket for this action under Docket ID No. OA-2002-0001. The proposed rule and supporting materials are available for public viewing at the Office of Environmental Information Docket in the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the Office of Environmental Information is (202) 566-1752. An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, EPA Dockets. You may use EPA Dockets at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket> to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select "search," and then key in docket identification number OA-2002-0001.

You may access this **Federal Register** document electronically through the EPA Internet under the "**Federal Register**" listings at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr>.

Dates: The public hearings addressed by this **Federal Register** Proposal are scheduled as follows:

1. September 23, 2003, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
2. September 24, 2003, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Boston, Massachusetts.
3. October 22, 2003, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Atlanta, Georgia.
4. November 13, 2003, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Seattle, Washington.
5. November 18, 2003, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Dallas, Texas.
6. January 13, 2004, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Chicago, Illinois.
7. January 20, 2004, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., San Francisco, California.

Addresses: The hearings will be held at the following locations:

1. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Wanamaker Building, Training Center Rooms 10A/B, 100 Penn Square East, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3380.
2. Faneuil Hall, 1 Faneuil Hall Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109.
3. Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 2nd Floor, Conference Rooms B & C, 61 Forsyth Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960.
4. Jackson Federal Building, North Auditorium, 915 Second Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.
5. 1445 Ross Avenue, 12th Floor Conference Room, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733.
6. Metcalfe Federal Building, Room 331, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604-3507.
7. First Floor Conference Room, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105.

Dated: September 12, 2003.

Thomas J. Gibson,
Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. 03-23753 Filed 9-16-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[NC 106-200336(b); FRL-7558-8]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans North Carolina: Miscellaneous Revisions to the North Carolina State Implementation Plan

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is approving the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of North Carolina on April 4, 2003, for the purpose of establishing revisions to Volatile Organic Compounds and other miscellaneous revisions. In the Final Rules Section of this **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 submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no significant, material, and adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated. If 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 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: Written comments must be received on or before October 17, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted by mail to: Rosymar De La Torre Colón, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Comments may also be submitted electronically, or through hand delivery/courier. Please follow the detailed instructions described in sections I.B.1.i. through iii. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section which is published in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Rosymar De La Torre Colón, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, Region 4, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. The telephone number is (404) 562-8965. Ms. De La Torre Colón can also be reached via electronic mail at delatorre.rosymar@epa.gov.

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

Dated: August 28, 2003.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 03-23581 Filed 9-16-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 70

[MO 195-1195; FRL-7560-1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and Operating Permits Program revision submitted by the state of Missouri on May 12, 2003. These revisions, which became effective on April 30, 2003, correct all deficiencies described in the March 25, 2002, **Federal Register** Notice