

section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than January 27, 1996.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00

Proposed charge effective date: April 1, 1996

Proposed charge expiration date: February 28, 2006

Total estimated PFC revenue: \$125,050

Brief description of proposed project(s):

—Passenger Facility Charge Application
—Runway 9–27 Rehabilitation (Design)
—Runway 9–27 Rehabilitation (Construction)

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Not Applicable, all requested to collect PFCs.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA Regional Airports Office located at Fitzgerald Federal Building #111; John F. Kennedy International Airport; Jamaica, New York 11430.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Ogdensburg Bridge and Port Authority.

Issued in Jamaica, New York on November 24, 1995.

Anthony P. Spera,

Manager, Airports Division, Eastern Region.
[FR Doc. 95–29567 Filed 12–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

Revisions to the Sentencing Guidelines for the United States Courts

AGENCY: United States Sentencing Commission.

ACTION: Notice of final action regarding amendments to sentencing guidelines and policy statements effective November 1, 1995.

SUMMARY: The Sentencing Commission hereby gives notice of several amendments to policy statements and commentary made pursuant to its authority under section 217(a) of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 (28 U.S.C. 994(a) and (u)). The Commission has reviewed amendments submitted to Congress on May 1, 1995, that may result in a lower guideline

range and has designated one such amendment for inclusion in policy statement § 1B1.10 (Retroactivity of Amended Guideline Range). An earlier amendment (effective November 1, 1994) was also designated for inclusion in policy statement § 1B1.10. Two amendments, previously passed by the Commission, concerning crack cocaine and money laundering were disapproved by Congress (Pub. L. 104–38, 109 Stat. 34 (Oct. 30, 1995)).

DATES: The effective date of these policy statement and commentary amendments is November 1, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Courlander, Public Information Specialist, Telephone: (202) 273–4590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The United States Sentencing Commission is an independent agency in the judicial branch of the U.S. Government. The Commission is empowered by 28 U.S.C. 994(a) to promulgate sentencing guidelines and policy statements for federal sentencing courts. Sections 994(o) and (p) of title 28, United States Code, further direct the Commission to periodically review and revise guidelines and policy statements previously promulgated, and require that guideline amendments be submitted to Congress for review. Absent action of the Congress to the contrary, guideline amendments become effective following 180 days of Congressional review on the date specified by the Commission (i.e., November 1, 1995). Unlike new guidelines and amendments to existing guidelines issued pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(a) and (p), sentencing policy statements, commentary, and amendments thereto promulgated by the Commission are not required to be submitted to Congress for 180 days' review prior to their taking effect.

In connection with its ongoing review of the Guidelines Manual, the Commission continues to welcome comment on any aspect of the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary. Comments should be sent to: United States Sentencing Commission, One Columbus Circle, N.E., Suite 2–500, Washington, DC 20002–8002, Attn: Office of Communications.

Authority: Section 217(a) of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 (28 U.S.C. 994(a)).

Richard P. Conaboy,
Chairman.

Additional Revisions to the Guidelines Manual

1. The replacement guideline for § 2H1.1 (see 60 FR 25082 (1995)) is

amended by deleting Application Note 1 of the Commentary as follows:

“1. ‘Offense guideline applicable to any underlying offense’ means the offense guideline applicable to any conduct established by the offense of conviction that constitutes an offense under federal, state, or local law (other than an offense that is itself covered under Chapter Two, Part H, Subpart 1).

In certain cases, conduct set forth in the count of conviction may constitute more than one underlying offense (e.g., two instances of assault, or one instance of assault and one instance of arson). In such cases, determine the number and nature of underlying offenses by applying the procedure set forth in Application Note 5 of § 1B1.2 (Applicable Guidelines). If the Chapter Two offense level for any of the underlying offenses under subsection (a)(1) is the same as, or greater than, the alternative base offense level under subsection (a)(2), (3), or (4), as applicable, use subsection (a)(1) and treat each underlying offense as if contained in a separate count of conviction. Otherwise, use subsection (a)(2), (3), or (4), as applicable, to determine the base offense level.”, and inserting in lieu thereof:

“1. ‘Offense guideline applicable to any underlying offense’ means the offense guideline applicable to any conduct established by the offense of conviction that constitutes an offense under federal, state, or local law (other than an offense that is itself covered under Chapter Two, Part H, Subpart 1).

In certain cases, conduct set forth in the count of conviction may constitute more than one underlying offense (e.g., two instances of assault, or one instance of assault and one instance of arson). In such cases, use the following comparative procedure to determine the applicable base offense level: (i) determine the underlying offenses encompassed within the count of conviction as if the defendant had been charged with a conspiracy to commit multiple offenses. See Application Note 5 of § 1B1.2 (Applicable Guidelines); (ii) determine the Chapter Two offense level (i.e., the base offense level, specific offense characteristics, cross references, and special instructions) for each such underlying offense; and (iii) compare each of the Chapter Two offense levels determined above with the alternative base offense level under subsection (a)(2), (3), or (4). The determination of the applicable alternative base offense level is to be based on the entire conduct underlying the count of conviction (i.e., the conduct taken as a whole). Use the alternative base offense

level only if it is greater than each of the Chapter Two offense levels determined above. Otherwise, use the Chapter Two offense levels for each of the underlying offenses (with each underlying offense treated as if contained in a separate count of conviction). Then apply subsection (b) to the alternative base offense level, or to the Chapter Two offense levels for each of the underlying offenses, as appropriate.”.

This amendment clarifies the operation of this guideline in cases involving multiple underlying offenses.

2. Section 5G1.3 is amended by deleting:

“(c) (Policy Statement) In any other case, the sentence for the instant offense shall be imposed to run consecutively to the prior undischarged term of imprisonment to the extent necessary to achieve a reasonable incremental punishment for the instant offense.”, and inserting in lieu thereof:

“(c) (Policy Statement) In any other case, the sentence for the instant offense may be imposed to run concurrently, partially concurrently, or consecutively to the prior undischarged term of imprisonment to achieve a reasonable punishment for the instant offense.”.

The Commentary to § 5G1.3 captioned “Application Notes” is amended in Note 1 by inserting “Consecutive sentence—subsection (a) cases.” immediately before “Under”; and by deleting “where the instant offense (or any part thereof)” and inserting in lieu thereof “when the instant offense”.

The Commentary to § 5G1.3 captioned “Application Notes” is amended by deleting:

“2. Subsection (b) (which may apply only if subsection (a) does not apply), addresses cases in which the conduct resulting in the undischarged term of imprisonment has been fully taken into account under § 1B1.3 (Relevant Conduct) in determining the offense level for the instant offense. This can occur, for example, where a defendant is prosecuted in both federal and state court, or in two or more federal jurisdictions, for the same criminal conduct or for different criminal transactions that were part of the same course of conduct.

When a sentence is imposed pursuant to subsection (b), the court should adjust for any term of imprisonment already served as a result of the conduct taken into account in determining the sentence for the instant offense.

Example: The defendant has been convicted of a federal offense charging the sale of 30 grams of cocaine. Under § 1B1.3 (Relevant Conduct), the defendant is held accountable for the

sale of an additional 15 grams of cocaine that is part of the same course of conduct for which the defendant has been convicted and sentenced in state court (the defendant received a nine-month sentence of imprisonment, of which he has served six months at the time of sentencing on the instant federal offense). The guideline range applicable to the defendant is 10–16 months (Chapter Two offense level of 14 for sale of 45 grams of cocaine; 2-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility; final offense level of 12; Criminal History Category I). The court determines that a sentence of 13 months provides the appropriate total punishment. Because the defendant has already served six months on the related state charge, a sentence of seven months, imposed to run concurrently with the remainder of the defendant’s state sentence, achieves this result. For clarity, the court should note on the Judgment in a Criminal Case Order that the sentence imposed is not a departure from the guidelines because the defendant has been credited for guideline purposes under § 5G1.3(b) with six months served in state custody.

3. Where the defendant is subject to an undischarged term of imprisonment in circumstances other than those set forth in subsections (a) or (b), subsection (c) applies and the court shall impose a consecutive sentence to the extent necessary to fashion a sentence resulting in a reasonable incremental punishment for the multiple offenses. In some circumstances, such incremental punishment can be achieved by the imposition of a sentence that is concurrent with the remainder of the unexpired term of imprisonment. In such cases, a consecutive sentence is not required. To the extent practicable, the court should consider a reasonable incremental penalty to be a sentence for the instant offense that results in a combined sentence of imprisonment that approximates the total punishment that would have been imposed under § 5G1.2 (Sentencing on Multiple Counts of Conviction) had all of the offenses been federal offenses for which sentences were being imposed at the same time. It is recognized that this determination frequently will require an approximation. Where the defendant is serving a term of imprisonment for a state offense, the information available may permit only a rough estimate of the total punishment that would have been imposed under the guidelines. Where the offense resulting in the undischarged term of imprisonment is a federal offense for which a guideline determination has previously been made, the task will be somewhat more

straightforward, although even in such cases a precise determination may not be possible.

It is not intended that the above methodology be applied in a manner that unduly complicates or prolongs the sentencing process. Additionally, this methodology does not, itself, require the court to depart from the guideline range established for the instant federal offense. Rather, this methodology is meant to assist the court in determining the appropriate sentence (e.g., the appropriate point within the applicable guideline range, whether to order the sentence to run concurrently or consecutively to the undischarged term of imprisonment, or whether a departure is warranted). Generally, the court may achieve an appropriate sentence through its determination of an appropriate point within the applicable guideline range for the instant federal offense, combined with its determination of whether that sentence will run concurrently or consecutively to the undischarged term of imprisonment.

Illustrations of the Application of Subsection (c):

(A) The guideline range applicable to the instant federal offense is 24–30 months. The court determines that a total punishment of 36 months’ imprisonment would appropriately reflect the instant federal offense and the offense resulting in the undischarged term of imprisonment. The undischarged term of imprisonment is an indeterminate sentence of imprisonment with a 60-month maximum. At the time of sentencing on the instant federal offense, the defendant has served ten months on the undischarged term of imprisonment. In this case, a sentence of 26 months’ imprisonment to be served concurrently with the remainder of the undischarged term of imprisonment would (1) be within the guideline range for the instant federal offense, and (2) achieve an appropriate total punishment (36 months).

(B) The applicable guideline range for the instant federal offense is 24–30 months. The court determines that a total punishment of 36 months’ imprisonment would appropriately reflect the instant federal offense and the offense resulting in the undischarged term of imprisonment. The undischarged term of imprisonment is a six-month determinate sentence. At the time of sentencing on the instant federal offense, the defendant has served three months on the undischarged term of imprisonment. In this case, a sentence of 30 months’ imprisonment to be served

consecutively to the undischarged term of imprisonment would (1) be within the guideline range for the instant federal offense, and (2) achieve an appropriate total punishment (36 months).

(C) The applicable guideline range for the instant federal offense is 24–30 months. The court determines that a total punishment of 60 months' imprisonment would appropriately reflect the instant federal offense and the offense resulting in the undischarged term of imprisonment. The undischarged term of imprisonment is a 12-month determinate sentence. In this case, a sentence of 30 months' imprisonment to be served consecutively to the undischarged term of imprisonment would be the greatest sentence imposable without departure for the instant federal offense.

(D) The applicable guideline range for the instant federal offense is 24–30 months. The court determines that a total punishment of 36 months' imprisonment would appropriately reflect the instant federal offense and the offense resulting in the undischarged term of imprisonment. The undischarged term of imprisonment is an indeterminate sentence with a 60-month maximum. At the time of sentencing on the instant federal offense, the defendant has served 22 months on the undischarged term of imprisonment. In this case, a sentence of 24 months to be served concurrently with the remainder of the undischarged term of imprisonment would be the lowest sentence imposable without departure for the instant federal offense.

4. If the defendant was on federal or state probation, parole, or supervised release at the time of the instant offense, and has had such probation, parole, or supervised release revoked, the sentence for the instant offense should be imposed to be served consecutively to the term imposed for the violation of probation, parole, or supervised release in order to provide an incremental penalty for the violation of probation, parole, or supervised release (in accord with the policy expressed in §§ 7B1.3 and 7B1.4)",

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"2. Adjusted concurrent sentence—subsection (b) cases. When a sentence is imposed pursuant to subsection (b), the court should adjust the sentence for any period of imprisonment already served as a result of the conduct taken into account in determining the guideline range for the instant offense if the court determines that period of imprisonment will not be credited to the federal sentence by the Bureau of Prisons.

Example: The defendant is convicted of a federal offense charging the sale of 30 grams of cocaine. Under § 1B1.3 (Relevant Conduct), the defendant is held accountable for the sale of an additional 15 grams of cocaine, an offense for which the defendant has been convicted and sentenced in state court. The defendant received a nine-month sentence of imprisonment for the state offense and has served six months on that sentence at the time of sentencing on the instant federal offense. The guideline range applicable to the defendant is 10–16 months (Chapter Two offense level of 14 for sale of 45 grams of cocaine; 2-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility; final offense level of 12; Criminal History Category I). The court determines that a sentence of 13 months provides the appropriate total punishment. Because the defendant has already served six months on the related state charge as of the date of sentencing on the instant federal offense, a sentence of seven months, imposed to run concurrently with the three months remaining on the defendant's State sentence, achieves this result. For clarity, the court should note on the Judgment in a Criminal Case Order that the sentence imposed is not a departure from the guideline range because the defendant has been credited for guideline purposes under § 5G1.3(b) with six months served in state custody that will not be credited to the federal sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3585(b).

3. Concurrent or consecutive sentence—subsection (c) cases. In circumstances not covered under subsection (a) or (b), subsection (c) applies. Under this subsection, the court may impose a sentence concurrently, partially concurrently, or consecutively. To achieve a reasonable punishment and avoid unwarranted disparity, the court should consider the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3584 (referencing 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)) and be cognizant of:

(a) The type (e.g., determinate, indeterminate/parolable) and length of the prior undischarged sentence;

(b) The time served on the undischarged sentence and the time likely to be served before release;

(c) The fact that the prior undischarged sentence may have been imposed in state court rather than federal court, or at a different time before the same or different federal court; and

(d) Any other circumstance relevant to the determination of an appropriate sentence for the instant offense.

4. Partially concurrent sentence. In some cases under subsection (c), a partially concurrent sentence may achieve most appropriately the desired

result. To impose a partially concurrent sentence, the court may provide in the Judgment in a Criminal Case Order that the sentence for the instant offense shall commence (A) when the defendant is released from the prior undischarged sentence, or (B) on a specified date, whichever is earlier. This order provides for a fully consecutive sentence if the defendant is released on the undischarged term of imprisonment on or before the date specified in the order, and a partially concurrent sentence if the defendant is not released on the undischarged term of imprisonment by that date.

5. Complex situations. Occasionally, the court may be faced with a complex case in which a defendant may be subject to multiple undischarged terms of imprisonment that seemingly call for the application of different rules. In such a case, the court may exercise its discretion in accordance with subsection (c) to fashion a sentence of appropriate length and structure it to run in any appropriate manner to achieve a reasonable punishment for the instant offense.

6. Revocations. If the defendant was on federal or state probation, parole, or supervised release at the time of the instant offense, and has had such probation, parole, or supervised release revoked, the sentence for the instant offense should be imposed to run consecutively to the term imposed for the violation of probation, parole, or supervised release in order to provide an incremental penalty for the violation of probation, parole, or supervised release. See § 7B1.3 (Revocation of Probation or Supervised Release) (setting forth a policy that any imprisonment penalty imposed for violating probation or supervised release should be consecutive to any sentence of imprisonment being served or subsequently imposed)."

The Commentary to § 5G1.3 captioned "Background" is amended by deleting:

"This guideline provides direction to the court when a term of imprisonment is imposed on a defendant who is already subject to an undischarged term of imprisonment. See 18 U.S.C. § 3584. Except in the cases in which subsection (a) applies, this guideline is intended to result in an appropriate incremental punishment for the instant offense that most nearly approximates the sentence that would have been imposed had all the sentences been imposed at the same time."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"In a case in which a defendant is subject to an undischarged sentence of imprisonment, the court generally has

authority to impose an imprisonment sentence on the current offense to run concurrently with or consecutively to the prior undischarged term. 18 U.S.C. § 3584(a). Exercise of that authority, however, is predicated on the court's consideration of the factors listed in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), including any applicable guidelines or policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission."

This is a two-part amendment. First, this amendment clarifies the application of subsections (a) and (b) of this guideline. Second, in circumstances covered by the policy statement in subsection (c), this amendment affords the sentencing court additional flexibility to impose, as appropriate, a consecutive, concurrent, or partially concurrent sentence in order to achieve a reasonable punishment for the instant offense.

Authority to impose a partially concurrent sentence is found in the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 (SRA). In enacting 28 U.S.C. § 994(l)(1), Congress contemplated that 18 U.S.C. § 3584 would allow imposition of partially concurrent sentences, in addition to fully concurrent or consecutive sentences. ("It is the Committee's intent that, to the extent feasible, the sentences for each of the multiple offenses be determined separately and the degree to which they should overlap be specified.") S. Rep.

No. 225, 98th Cong., 1st Sess. 177 (1983). Without the ability to fashion such a sentence, the instruction to the Commission in 28 U.S.C. § 994(l)(1) to provide a reasonable incremental penalty for additional offenses could not be implemented successfully in certain situations, particularly when the defendant's release date on an undischarged term of imprisonment cannot be determined readily in advance (e.g., in the case of an indeterminate sentence subject to parole release).

Prior to the SRA, only the Bureau of Prisons had the authority to commence a federal sentence prior to the defendant's release from imprisonment on a state sentence. See, e.g., *United States v. Segal*, 549 F.2d 1293, 1301 (9th Cir. 1977). SRA legislative history pertaining to 18 U.S.C. § 3584 indicates that this new section was intended to authorize imposition of a federal prison sentence to run concurrently or consecutively to a state prison sentence. "This * * * [section 3584] changes the law that now applies to a person sentenced for a Federal offense who is already serving a term of imprisonment for a state offense." S. Rep. No. 225, supra at 127. "Thus, it is intended that this provision be construed contrary to the holding in *United States v. Segal*. * * *" Id. (at 127 n.314). See *United States v. Hardesty*, 958 F.2d 910, 914

(stating that, under section 3584, "Congress has expressly granted federal judges the discretion to impose a sentence concurrent to a state prison term"), aff'd en banc, 977 F.2d 1347 (9th Cir. 1992).

3. Section 1B1.10(c) is amended by deleting "and 506" and inserting in lieu thereof "505, 506, and 516".

The Commentary to § 1B1.10 captioned "Background" is amended in the fourth paragraph by inserting an asterisk immediately following "old guidelines"; and by inserting, as a note, following the Background Commentary:

"*So in original. Probably should be 'to fall above the amended guidelines'."

This amendment expands the listing in § 1B1.10(d) to implement the directive in 28 U.S.C. § 994(u) in respect to guideline amendments that may be considered for retroactive application. The amendment also makes an editorial addition to the Commentary to § 1B1.10 (Retroactivity of Amended Guideline Range).

In addition, the Commission has updated the "Historical Notes" following the amended guideline sections, and has made a number of additional minor conforming and editorial revisions to improve the internal consistency and appearance of the Manual.

[FR Doc. 95-29514 Filed 12-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210-40-P