Should the Commission provided additional and/or more restrictive guidance in section 4A1.3 regarding the circumstances under which the court may depart for the over-representation of the defendant's criminal history?

(4) Should the Commission provide additional and/or more restrictive guidance for any downward departure authorized in Chapter Two (Offense Conduct) for specific offenses?

(5) Should the Commission provide for a downward adjustment (or, in the case of criminal history, a reduction in criminal history points) in lieu of a downward departure for any factor or downward departure basis, or for a combination of factors and/or downward departures bases, described in paragraphs (1) through (4) above, or for any other mitigating factors the Commission should more fully take into account in the guidelines? If so, how should such a downward adjustment or reduction be structured, and what should be the extent of the downward adjustment or reduction? (Note that section 401(j)(2) of the PROTECT Act prohibits the Commission from adding any new grounds of downward departure to Part K of Chapter Five on or before May 1, 2005.)

(6) Should any of the downward departure bases described in paragraphs(1) through (4) above be prohibited as a basis for downward departure?

Are there other specific suggestions that the Commission might consider to respond to the directive?

Finally, section 401(m)(2) directs the Commission to promulgate a policy statement authorizing a downward departure of not more than 4 levels if the Government files a motion for such departure pursuant to an early disposition program authorized by the Attorney General and the United States Attorney. How should the Commission structure this downward departure?

[FR Doc. 03–16577 Filed 6–30–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 2211–01–P

### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

#### **Interest Rates**

The Small Business Administration publishes an interest rate called the optional "peg" rate (13 CFR 120.214) on a quarterly basis. This rate is a weighted average cost of money to the government for maturities similar to the average SBA direct loan. This rate may be used as a base rate for guaranteed fluctuating interest rate SBA loans. This rate will be  $4.250 (4^{1/4})$  percent for the July–September quarter of FY 2003.

### LeAnn M. Oliver,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Financial Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–16598 Filed 6–30–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 4390]

Office of Visa Services; 60-Day Notice of Proposed Information Collection: Form DS–1884, Petition To Classify Special Immigrant Under INA 203(b)(4) as an Employee or Former Employee of the U.S. Government Abroad; OMB Control Number 1405–0082

**AGENCY:** Department of State. **ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of State is seeking Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for the information collection described below. The purpose of this notice is to allow 60 days for public comment in the **Federal Register** preceding submission to OMB. This process is conducted in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

The following summarizes the information collection proposal to be submitted to OMB:

*Type of Request:* Extension of currently approved collection.

Originating Office: Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State (CA/VO).

Title of Information Collection: Petition To Classify Special Immigrant Under INA 203(b)(4) as an Employee or Former Employee of the U.S. Government Abroad.

*Frequency:* Once per respondent. *Form Number:* DS–1884.

*Respondents:* Aliens applying for Immigrant Visa under INA 203(b)(4).

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 500 per year.

Average Hours Per Response: 30 minutes.

*Total Estimated Burden:* 250 hours per year.

Public comments are being solicited to permit the agency to:

• Evaluate whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency.

• Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used.

• Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected.

• Minimize the reporting burden on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of technology.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Public comments, or requests for additional information regarding the collection listed in this notice should be directed to Brendan Mullarkey of the Office of Visa Services, U.S. Department of State, 2401 E St. NW., RM L–703, Washington, DC 20520, who may be reached at 202–663–1163.

Dated: June 23, 2003.

### Janice L. Jacobs,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Visa Services, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 03–16592 Filed 6–30–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4710–06–P

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

## [Public Notice 4389]

## Culturally Significant Objects Imported for Exhibition; Determinations: "Hudson River School Visions: The Landscapes of Sanford R. Gifford"

**AGENCY:** Department of State. **ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given of the following determinations: Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Act of October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 985; 22 U.S.C. 2459), Executive Order 12047 of March 27, 1978, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2681, et seq.; 22 U.S.C. 6501 note, et seq.), Delegation of Authority No. 234 of October 1, 1999 (64 FR 56014), and Delegation of Authority No. 236 of October 19, 1999 (64 FR 57920), as amended, I hereby determine that the object to be included in the exhibition, "Hudson River School Visions: The Landscapes of Sanford R. Gifford," imported from abroad for temporary exhibition within the United States, is of cultural significance. The object is imported pursuant to a loan agreement with a foreign lender. I also determine that the exhibition or display of the exhibit object at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, New York, from on or about October 7, 2003, to on or about February 8, 2004, the Amon Carter Museum, Fort Worth, Texas, from on or about May 4, 2004, to on or about May 16, 2004, the National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, from on or about June 27, 2004, to on or about September 26, 2004, and at possible additional venues yet to be determined, is in the national interest. Public Notice of these

determinations is ordered to be published in the **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information, including a description of the exhibit object, contact Paul W. Manning, Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, 202/619– 5997, and the address is United States Department of State, SA–44, Room 700, 301 4th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20547–0001.

Dated: June 23, 2003.

### C. Miller Crouch,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 03–16591 Filed 6–30–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4710–08–P

# DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 4388]

## Culturally Significant Objects Imported for Exhibition; Determinations: "The Crau at Ales: Peach Trees in Flower"

**AGENCY:** Department of State. **ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the following determinations: Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Act of October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 985; 22 U.S.C. 2459), Executive Order 12047 of March 27, 1978, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2681, et seq.; 22 U.S.C. 6501 note, et seq.), Delegation of Authority No. 234 of October 1, 1999 (64 FR 56014), and Delegation of Authority No. 236 of October 19, 1999 (64 FR 57920), as amended, I hereby determine that the object to be included in the exhibition, "The Crau at Ales: Peach Trees in Flower," imported from abroad for temporary exhibition within the United States, is of cultural significance. The object is imported pursuant to a loan agreement with a foreign lender. I also determine that the exhibition or display of the exhibit object at the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, California, from on or about August 5, 2003, to on or about January 13, 2004, and at possible additional venues yet to be determined, is in the national interest. Public Notice of these determinations is ordered to be published in the Federal Register.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information, including a description of the exhibit object, contact Paul W. Manning, Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, 202/619– 5997, and the address is United States Department of State, SA–44, Room 700, 301 4th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20547–0001. Dated: June 23, 2003. **C. Miller Crouch,** Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State. [FR Doc. 03–16590 Filed 6–30–03; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 4710–08–P** 

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

#### Federal Aviation Administration

[Docket No. FAA-2003-15495]

## Weight-Based Restrictions at Airports: Proposed Policy

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT). **ACTION:** Notice of proposed policy; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** This notice requests comments on a proposed statement of policy on the use of weight-based airport access restrictions as a means of protectign airfield pavement. In grant agreements between an airport operator and the FAA for Federal airport development grants, the airport operator makes certain assurances to the FAA. These assurances include an obligation to provide access to the airport on reasonable, not unjustly discriminatory terms to aeronautical users of the airport. Some airport operators have implemented restrictions on use of the airport by aircraft above a certain weight, to protect pavement not designed for aircraft of that weight. These actions have raised the question of when such an action is a reasonable restriction on use of the airport. In the interest of applyng a uniform national policy to such actions, the FAA is publishing for comment a draft policy on weight-based access restrictions at federally obligated airports.

DATES: Comments must be received by August 15, 2003. Comments that are received after that date will be considered only to the extent possible. **ADDRESSES:** The proposed policy is available for public review in the Dockets Office, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room Plaza 401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. The documents have been filed under FAA Docket Number FAA-2003–15495. The Dockets Office is open between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Dockets Office is on the plaza level of the Nassif Building at the Department of Transportation at the above address. Also, you, may review public dockets on the Internet at http://

/dms.dot.gov. Comments on the proposed policy must be delivered on mailed, in duplicate, to: the Docket Management System, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room Plaza 401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. You must identify the docket number "FAA Docket No FAA-2003–15495" at the beginning of your comments. Commenters wishing to FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments must include a preaddressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to FAA Docket No. FAA-2003–15495." The postcard will be date stamped and mailed to the commenter. You may also submit comments through the Internet to *http://dms.dot.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James White, Deputy Director, Office of Airport Safety and Standards, AAS–2, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave. SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267–3053.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Airport operators that accept federal airport development grants under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), 49 U.S.C. 47101 *et seq.*, enter into a standard grant agreement with the FAA. That agreement contains certain assurances, including assurance no. 22, based on the requirement in 49 U.S.C. 47107(a)(1). Grant assurance no. 22 reads, in part:

a. [The sponsor] will make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the airport.

At the same time, the FAA expects that airport sponsors will protect airfield pavement from damage or early deterioration. Many airport projects funded with the AIP grants involve pavement. As a result, both the FAA and airport sponsors have a significant investment in airfield pavement, and an interest in assuring that pavement remains in acceptable condition for its design life, normally at least 20 years. The policy of assuring reasonable access to the airport and the interest in protecting the investment in airfield pavement are both extremely important, but is clear that they can potentially work against each other in a particular case.

In February 2002, the Airports Division in an FAA regional office issued a preliminary determination on the ability of a particular airport operator to limit use of the airport according to aircraft weight. In that case the weight limit effectively prohibited operation by aircraft heavier than the