

sessions, program meetings, resource materials and follow-up activities).

4. Institutional Capability

Proposed personnel and institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program's goals. The narrative should demonstrate proven ability to handle logistics. Proposals should reflect the institution's expertise in the subject area and knowledge of the conditions in the targeted region(s).

5. Follow-on Activities

Proposals should provide a plan for continued follow-on activity (without USIA support) ensuring that USIA supported programs are not isolated events.

6. Project Evaluation

Proposals should include a plan and methodology to evaluate the program's successes, both as activities unfold and at the end of the program. USIA recommends that the proposals include a draft survey questionnaire or other technique plus description and/or plan for use of another measurement technique (such as a focus group) to link outcomes to original project objectives.

7. Cost-Effectiveness and Cost Sharing

Overhead and administrative costs in the proposal, including salaries, subcontracts for services and honoraria, should be kept low. Proposals should maximize cost-sharing through other private sector support as well as institutional direct funding contributions.

Notice: The terms and conditions published in this RFP are binding and may not be modified by any USIA representative. Explanatory information provided by the Agency that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of the RFP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the Government. The Agency reserves the right to reduce, revise or increase proposal budgets in accordance with the needs of the program and the availability of funds. Awards made will

be subject to periodic reporting and evaluation requirements. Organizations will be expected to cooperate with USIA in evaluating their programs under the principles of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, which requires federal agencies to measure and report on the results of their programs and activities.

Notification

Final awards cannot be made until funds have been appropriated by Congress, allocated and committed through internal USIA procedures.

Dated: October 2, 1998.

Judith Siegel,

Deputy Associate Director for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

[FR Doc. 98-27032 Filed 10-7-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8230-01-M

UTAH RECLAMATION MITIGATION AND CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Construction of the Diamond Fork Campground; Utah County, UT

AGENCY: The Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission (Mitigation Commission) and the Spanish Fork Ranger District of the Uinta National Forest, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the draft environmental assessment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) issued a Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in 1984 and a Final Supplement to the Final EIS in 1990 for the Diamond Fork System recommending among other things, the construction of a campground and associated recreation facilities in Diamond Fork Canyon to mitigate for camping facilities impacted by the construction activities and to provide recreational opportunities for growing populations along the Wasatch Front.

The Spanish Fork Ranger District of the Uinta National Forest and the Mitigation Commission released an Environmental Assessment (EA) dated February 23, 1997, describing the environmental effects of a proposal to redesign and upgrade the existing Diamond and Palmyra campgrounds. Based on public and agency input, the Spanish Fork Ranger District and the Mitigation Commission have revised the EA to incorporate a new alternative that responds to concerns raised. The new proposal would rehabilitate the existing Diamond and Palmyra Campgrounds, yet reduce the capacity approximately by 33%. This is a significant change from the previous proposal where the campground capacity would have been increased by approximately 46%. This change in the proposal reduces the impacts on riparian vegetation and minimizes the potential impacts on future stream restoration efforts. These were the two primary concerns raised by agencies and the public during the initial release of the EA.

A pre-decisional EA was prepared jointly by the U.S. Forest Service and the Commission and released for public review on September 28, 1998. A 30-day public comment period closed on October 28, 1998.

DATES: Comments are most useful if received by October 28, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Copies of the the Draft EA or Executive Summary can be obtained at the address and telephone number below: Richard Mingo, Natural Resource Specialist, Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission, 102 West 500 South, Suite 315, Salt Lake City, UT 84101-2328, Telephone: (801) 524-3146.

Dated: October 1, 1998.

Michael C. Weland,

Executive Director, Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.

[FR Doc. 98-27014 Filed 10-7-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-P