

space to Hanjin in the trades between the U.S. West Coast, on the one hand, and Mexico and Asia, on the other.

Agreement No.: 201124-001.

Title: Oakland/Yang Ming Terminal Use Agreement.

Parties:

City of Oakland,

Yang Ming Transport Corporation.

Synopsis: The amendment terminates the parties' terminal use agreement.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Dated: August 8, 2003.

Karen V. Gregory,

Acting Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-20656 Filed 8-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730-01-P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Ocean Transportation Intermediary License Applicants

Notice is hereby given that the following applicants have filed with the Federal Maritime Commission an application for license as a Non-Vessel Operating Common Carrier and Ocean Freight Forwarder—Ocean Transportation Intermediary pursuant to section 19 of the Shipping Act of 1984 as amended (46 U.S.C. app. 1718 and 46 CFR 515).

Persons knowing of any reason why the following applicants should not receive a license are requested to contact the Office of Transportation Intermediaries, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573.

Non-Vessel Operating Common Carrier Ocean Transportation Intermediary Applicants

Worldtrans Services, Inc., 8925 Carroll Way, Suite C, San Diego, CA 92121.

Officers: Tony Carnevale, Vice President, (Qualifying Individual), Charles H. Saathoff, President.

Ocean Lilly Express, LLC, 8501 NW. 17th Street, Suite 101, Miami, FL 33126. *Officers:* Alan Egan, President, (Qualifying Individual), Nelson Cabrera, Vice President.

CTC Logistics (L.A.) Inc., 9111 S. La Cienega Blvd., Suite 205, Inglewood, CA 90301. *Officers:* Ms. Xiaomei Lu, Chief Operations Officer, (Qualifying Individual), Yonglong Li, President.

Caribbean Cargo & Package Services Inc., Building #80 JFK International Airport, Jamaica, NY 11430.

Officers: Franklin Clifford Vieira, President, (Qualifying Individual), Harold Smith, Director.

Admiral Marine, Inc., 33 Wood Avenue South, Iselin, NJ 08830. *Officers:*

Fred Grootarz, President, (Qualifying Individual), Henry Kiesel, Vice President.

Ace Express (New York) Inc., 147-39 175 Street, Suite 101, Jamaica, NY 11434-5463. *Officer:* Ivan P. Hong, President, (Qualifying Individual).

Non-Vessel Operating Common Carrier and Ocean Freight Forwarder Transportation Intermediary Applicants

Wen-Parker, Inc., 230-19 International Airport Center Blvd., Suite 238, Jamaica, NY 11413. *Officer:* Weiming New, President, (Qualifying Individual).

Motherlines Inc., 1419 Oak Tree Road, Iselin, NJ 08830. *Officers:* N. Santhosh Kumar, Vice President, (Qualifying Individual), A.B. Sankarankutty, Director.

Kartash, Inc., 11 Sunrise Plaza, Suite 200, Valley Stream, NY 11580. *Officers:* Raisa Kartasheusky, President, (Qualifying Individual), Edward Kartasheusky, Vice President.

Ocean Freight Forwarder—Ocean Transportation Intermediary Applicant

Continental Resource Company, 2639 East Avenue, Hayward, CA 94541. Jack Chiang, Sole Proprietor.

Dated: August 8, 2003.

Karen V. Gregory,

Acting Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-20657 Filed 8-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Notice of Hearing: Reconsideration of Disapproval of Virginia State Plan Amendment (SPA) 02-09

AGENCY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), HHS.

ACTION: Notice of hearing.

SUMMARY: This notice announces an administrative hearing on September 25, 2003, 10 a.m., Room 217; Second Floor; Suite 216, The Public Ledger Building; 150 South Independence Mall West; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106 to reconsider our decision to disapprove Virginia State Plan Amendment (SPA) 02-09.

Closing Date: Requests to participate in the hearing as a party must be received by the presiding officer by August 28, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kathleen Scully-Hayes, Presiding Officer, CMS, 2520 Lord Baltimore Drive, Suite L, Baltimore, Maryland 21244-2670, Telephone: (410) 786-2055.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice announces an administrative hearing to reconsider the decision, dated June 16, 2003, to disapprove Virginia State Plan Amendment (SPA) 02-09. This SPA proposes to provide supplemental payment for services rendered by a newly created class of physicians and other health professionals who are State employees affiliated with a State academic medical center. There are two supplemental payment methodologies described in the SPA. The first, effective July 2, 2002, until August 12, 2002, would provide payment equal to the difference between the amount indicated on the Medical Assistance (Medicaid) fee schedule applicable to other providers of the same type, and the lower of Medicare-allowed amount or billed charges. The second method, effective August 13, 2002, would be equal to the difference between the Medicaid fee schedule and providers' usual and customary charges. There is no ceiling on charges during the second period.

At issue is whether the State has documented that its proposed supplemental payment methodology is consistent with efficiency, economy, and quality of care when the supplemental payment methodology: (1) Is not justified by any increased costs to the State to ensure access to services for Medicaid beneficiaries; (2) pays significantly more than other third party payers for the same services; (3) is not a usual and customary payment methodology; and (4) would unduly complicate tracking and audit processes.

Section 1902 (a)(30)(A) of the Social Security Act (the Act) requires that states have methods and procedures to ensure that payments are consistent with efficiency, economy, and quality of care. The State was unable to document that other third party payers pay an amount equal to billed charges. In addition, the State did not document that the providers affected by this amendment have higher costs than other providers of the same type in the State, nor did it demonstrate that any portion of the increased payment would be required to pay actual costs incurred in order to ensure access to the Medicaid services at issue. Virginia also failed to justify why the supplemental payment is warranted for public providers only.

The supplemental payment methodology proposed by the State is