3. *Ability to achieve program objectives:* Objectives should be reasonable, feasible, and flexible. Proposals should clearly demonstrate how the organization will meet the program's objectives and plan.

4. *Support of Diversity:* Proposals should demonstrate substantive support of the Bureau's policy on diversity. Achievable and relevant features should be cited in both program administration (selection of participants, program venue and program evaluation) and program content (orientation and wrap-up sessions, program meetings, resource materials and follow-up activities).

5. *Institutional Capacity:* Proposed personnel and institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program or project's goals. Proposing organization should demonstrate it has experience with computer education, preferably with youth, as well as familiarity with the culture of the New Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union.

6. *Track Record:* Proposals should demonstrate an institutional record of successful programs, including responsible fiscal management and full compliance with all reporting requirements for past Bureau grants as determined by Bureau Grant Staff. The Bureau will consider the past performance of prior recipients and the demonstrated potential of new applicants.

7. *Multiplier effect/impact:* Proposed programs should describe how workshop participants will be motivated and enabled to reach out to other individuals in their communities in the U.S. and in their home countries.

8. *Follow-on Activities:* Proposals should describe how the program will track participants to confirm that they share their knowledge and information with their U.S. communities and organize ways to teach others in their home countries.

9. *Project Evaluation:* Proposals should include a plan to evaluate the activity's success. A draft survey questionnaire or other technique plus description of a methodology to use to link outcomes to original project objectives are recommended. Successful applicants will be expected to submit a final report after the project has been completed.

10. *Cost-effectiveness/Cost Sharing:* The overhead and administrative components of the proposal, including salaries and honoraria, should be kept as low as possible. All other items should be necessary and appropriate. Proposals should maximize cost-sharing through other private sector support as well as institutional direct funding contributions.

Authority

Overall grant making authority for this program is contained in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Public Law 87–256, as amended, also known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. The purpose of the Act is ''to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries * * *; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations * * * and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world.'' The funding authority for the program above is provided through legislation of the Freedom Support Act.

Notice

The terms and conditions published in this RFGP are binding and may not be modified by any Bureau representative. Explanatory information provided by the Bureau that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of the RFGP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the Government. The Bureau 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.

Notification

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

Dated: November 26, 2001.

Patricia S. Harrison,

Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

[FR Doc. 01–30137 Filed 12–4–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Public Notice for Waiver of Aeronautical Land-Use Assurance; Greater Kankakee Airport, Kankakee, IL

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Corrected notice of intent of waiver with respect to land.

SUMMARY: Previous notice of intent of waiver with respect to land was published in the **Federal Register** on November 27, 2001 (page 59297). The notice provided that comments must be received on or before November 27, 2001 and did not provide 30 days for public comment as required. This corrected notice amends the date for comments to be filed. Comments must be received on or before December 27, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Denis Rewerts, Program Manager, 2300 East Devon Avenue, Des Plaines, IL, 60018. Telephone Number 847–294–7195/FAX Number 847–294–7046.

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on November 28, 2001.

Philip M. Smithmeyer,

Manager, Chicago Airports District Office, FAA, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 01–30175 Filed 12–4–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Request To Release Airport Land at the Safford Municipal Airport, Safford, Arizona From Certain Restrictions Contained in the Patent Dated April 3, 1956

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to rule on request to release airport land from certain restrictions contained in the Patent No. 1158979 dated April 3, 1956.

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the release of approximately 183.30 acres of land at the Safford Municipal Airport, Safford, Arizona, from certain restrictions contained in the Patent dated April 3, 1956. The purpose of the release is to permit the use of approximately 183.30 acres of airport property to be developed for non-aeronautical purposes, but remain dedicated airport land.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before January 4, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, P.O. Box 92007, Los Angeles, CA 90009. In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Ronald Jacobson, City

Manager, City of Safford, P.O. Box 272 Safford, AZ 85548–0272.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Kevin Flynn, Supervisor, Arizona Standards Section, Airports Division, AWP–623, P.O. Box 92007, Los Angeles, CA 90009, Telephone: (310) 725–3632. Arrangements may be made with Mr. Flynn to review the request to release the subject airport property from certain obligations in person at the FAA Western-Pacific Regional office, 15000 Aviation Blvd., Hawthorne, CA 90250.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 5, 2000, new authorizing legislation became effective. That bill, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR 21), Public Law 10–181 (Apr. 5, 2000; 114 Stat. 61), requires that a 30-day public notice must be provided before the Secretary may waive any condition imposed on an interest in surplus property.

The following is a brief overview of the request:

On April 3, 1956, the United States Department of Interior, acting under the authority of section 16 of the Federal Airport Act of 1946, granted patent No. 1158979 to the Town of Safford, Arizona for 692.66 acres to be developed as a public use airport. The City of Safford has requested the release of approximately 183.30 acres of dedicated airport land at the Safford Municipal Airport, Safford Arizona from certain restrictions contained in the Patent dated April 3, 1956. The purpose of the release is to permit the use of dedicated airport property for non-aeronautical purposes. Net proceeds from the leasing and development of the subject land will be utilized by the city for capital improvements, operation, and maintenance at the Safford Municipal Airport.

Issued in Hawthorne, California, on November 15, 2001.

Herman C. Bliss,

Manager, Airports Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 01–30133 Filed 12–4–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE–2001–92]

Petitions for Exemption; Summary of Dispositions of Petitions Issued

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Disposition of prior petitions.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to FAA's rulemaking provisions governing the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for exemption part 11 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR), this notice contains a summary of dispositions of certain petitions previously received. The purpose of this notice is to improve the public's awareness of, and participation in, this aspect of FAA's regulatory activities. Neither publication of this notice nor the inclusion or omission of information in the summary is intended to affect the legal status of any petition or its final disposition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Forest Rawls (202) 267–8033, Sandy Buchanan-Sumter (202) 267–7271, or Vanessa Wilkins (202) 267–8029, Office of Rulemaking (ARM–1), Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

This notice is published pursuant to 14 CFR 11.85 and 11.91.

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 29, 2001.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Disposition of Petitions

Docket No.: FAA–2001–10789 (previously Docket No. 29903).

Petitioner: Bain Aviation, Inc., dba Tavaero Jet Charter, Inc.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit TJC to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.

Grant, 11/13/2001, Exemption No. 7146A.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–10793 (previously Docket No. 29116).

Petitioner: Taconite Aviation, Inc.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit TAI to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.

Grant, 11/13/2001, Exemption No. 6735B.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–9618 (previously Docket No. 24165).

Petitioner: U.S. Air Force.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 91.209(a) and (b).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the USAF to conduct helicopter night-vision flight training operations without lighted aircraft position lights at or below 500 feet above ground level.

Grant, 11/13/2001, Exemption No. 5891B.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–10790 (previously Docket No. 27118).

Petitioner: Air Logistics, L.L.C.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit Air Logistics to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.

Grant, 11/13/2001, Exemption No. 6736B.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–10920.

Petitioner: Yute Air Taxi, Inc.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit YAT to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.

Grant, 11/13/2001, Exemption No. 7658.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–10838.

Petitioner: Frontline Aviation, Inc.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit FAI to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.

Grant, 11/13/2001, Exemption No. 7660.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–10839.

Petitioner: Alaska Flying Tours.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit AFT to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.

Grant, 11/13/2001, Exemption No. 7657.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–10927.

Petitioner: Miller Aero Services, Inc.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit MAS to operate certain aircraft under part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed in the aircraft.

Grant, 11/13/2001, Exemption No. 7659.

Docket No.: FAA–2001–10853 (previously Docket No. 29783).

Petitioner: Indiaanapolis Aviation, Inc.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).