

and in the Solicitation Package. All eligible proposals will be reviewed by the program office, as well as the appropriate Public Diplomacy Section overseas. Eligible proposals will be subject to compliance with Federal and Bureau regulations and guidelines and forwarded to Bureau grant panels for advisory review. Proposals may also be reviewed by the Office of the Legal Adviser or by other Department elements. Final funding decisions are at the discretion of the Department of State's Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Final technical authority for assistance awards resides with the Bureau's Grants Officer.

Review Criteria

Technically eligible applications will be competitively reviewed according to the criteria stated below. These criteria are not rank ordered and all carry equal weight in the proposal evaluation:

1. *Quality of the program idea:* Proposals should exhibit originality, substance, precision, and relevance to the Bureau's mission.
2. *Program planning:* Detailed agenda and relevant work plan should demonstrate substantive undertakings and logistical capacity. Agenda and plan should adhere to the program overview and guidelines described above.
3. *Ability to achieve program objectives:* Objectives should be reasonable, feasible, and flexible. Proposals should clearly demonstrate how the institution will meet the program's objectives and plan.
4. *Multiplier effect/impact:* Proposed programs should strengthen long-term mutual understanding, including maximum sharing of information and establishment of long-term institutional and individual linkages.
5. *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).
6. *Institutional Capacity:* Proposed personnel and institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program or project's goals.
7. *Institution's Record/Ability:* Proposals should demonstrate an institutional record of successful exchange 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.

8. *Follow-on Activities:* Proposals should provide a plan for continued follow-on activity (without Bureau support) ensuring that Bureau supported programs are not isolated events.

9. *Project Evaluation:* Proposals should include a plan to evaluate the activity's success, both as the activities unfold and at the end of the program. A draft survey questionnaire or other technique plus description of a methodology used to link outcomes to original project objectives is recommended. Successful applicants will be expected to submit intermediate reports after each project component is concluded or quarterly, whichever is less frequent.

10. *Cost-effectiveness:* 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 whose administrative costs are 20% or less of the total requested from ECA will be deemed more competitive.

11. *Cost-sharing:* 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 Public Law 103-236. The purpose of the legislation is to make available scholarships for qualified East Timorese students to study at U.S. colleges and universities. The funding authority for the United States—East Timor Scholarship Program is provided through legislation.

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: January 29, 2002.

Patricia S. Harrison,

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

[FR Doc. 02-3007 Filed 2-6-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: King County Washington

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent

SUMMARY: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation, is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for the proposal to either repair or replace the South Park Bridge, which crosses the Duwamish River in King County, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Healy, Transportation and Environmental Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 711 South Capital Way, Suite 501, Olympia, Washington 98501-1284, Telephone: (360) 753-8655 or Jim Sussex, Environmental Engineer, King County, Road Services Division, Department of Transportation, King Street Center M.S. KSC-TR-0231, 201 South Jackson Street, Seattle, WA 98104-3856, Telephone: (206) 296-8737.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation and the King County Department of Transportation, will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposal to either repair or replace the South Park Bridge, which spans the Duwamish River between 14th Avenue South and 16th Avenue South. The existing movable span bridge structure is owned jointly by King County and the City of Tukwila, and the bridge approaches extend into the City of Seattle. The bridge was built in 1931, using a Scherzer Rolling Lift double leaf bascule span, with steel truss and concrete approach spans on both sides. In spite of substantial ongoing maintenance and repairs, the bridge has suffered significant deterioration over the past 70 years.

Damage that occurred during the Nisqually Earthquake of February 2001 has been repaired, but the bridge is increasingly vulnerable to future seismic events. The proposed project is necessary in order to implement a long-term solution to the deteriorated condition and the seismic vulnerability of the bridge. Specific alternatives for this project have not yet been developed. However, it is anticipated that approximately four build alternatives will be developed for analysis in the EIS, in addition to the no action alternative. The build alternatives may include: (1) Restoration of the existing bridge, (2) a movable span replacement bridge, and (3) a fixed span replacement bridge. The exact alignment and other significant design features may vary for each of these build alternatives, and variations may be different enough to warrant consideration as separate alternatives. Details regarding the number and character of these alternatives will be established through an extensive process of resource agency consultation and public involvement.

Scoping meetings will be held for the public and resource agencies during late February or early March 2002. A Project Advisory Committee (PAC) will be established to provide ongoing input from relevant government agencies and tribes. A Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) will be formed to provide additional involvement for representatives from neighborhood and business groups, as well as the public at large. A public hearing to gather public comments will be held after the draft EIS is issued and made available for public and agency review. The time and location of public meetings, when determined, will be announced in the local news media and public mailings.

Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA or King County at the addresses provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning, and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: January 31, 2002.

Elizabeth Healy,

*Transportation and Environmental Engineer,
Olympia, Washington.*

[FR Doc. 02-2922 Filed 2-6-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Federal Transit Administration

Revised Guidance for Implementing the March 1999 Circuit Court Decision Affecting Transportation Conformity

AGENCIES: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice; issuance of revised guidance.

SUMMARY: The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have issued revised guidance for implementing a March 1999 Circuit Court decision affecting transportation conformity. In previous guidance issued on June 18, 1999, the FHWA and FTA indicated that projects that had received funding commitments for construction prior to the conformity lapse could proceed during a lapse. However, project development activities such as right-of-way (ROW) acquisition and design that had received funding commitments prior to the conformity lapse could not proceed. After reviewing the implementation and effectiveness of the previous guidance, the FHWA and FTA decided to supplant the previous guidance and allow completion of all project phases during a conformity lapse, if such activities were approved prior to the lapse. The FHWA and FTA believe the revision is necessary for consistency and will help in streamlining the transportation planning and development process.

DATES: This revised guidance was effective on January 2, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For FHWA: Ms. Cecilia Ho, Office of Natural Environment (HEPN), (202) 366-9862; Mr. Gary Jensen, Office of Natural Environment (HEPN), (202) 366-2048; or Mr. Reid Alsop, Office of the Chief Counsel (HCC-30), (202) 366-1371. For FTA: Mr. Abbe Marner, Office of Planning (TPL-30), (202) 366-4317; or Mr. Scott Biehl, Office of the Chief Counsel (TCC-30), (202) 366-0748. Both agencies are located at 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded using a modem and suitable communications software from the Government Printing Office

Electronic Bulletin Board Service at (202) 512-1661. Internet users may reach the Office of the Federal Register's home page at <http://www.nara.gov/fedreg> and the Government Printing Office's Web page at <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara>. A copy of this guidance can be obtained by accessing the FHWA Web site at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/conformity/con_mdash;guid.htm.

March 2, 1999, Court Decision

Under section 176 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) as amended, the U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) cannot approve or fund any activity that does not conform to the State implementation plan (SIP) in nonattainment and maintenance areas. The CAA provides that conformity to an implementation plan means conformity to a SIP's purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the national ambient air quality standards and achieving expeditious attainment of such standards. Conformity to an implementation plan also means that such activities will not cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area; increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area. The FHWA and FTA funded activities must come from a transportation plan and transportation improvement program (TIP) that have been found to conform.

On March 2, 1999, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit issued a decision on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) August 1997 transportation conformity amendments in response to a case brought by the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) (*EDF v. EPA*, 167 F.3d 641 (DC Cir. 1999)). The court ruled that CAA Section 176(c)(2)(C) prohibits the U.S. DOT from approving or funding new projects in the absence of a conforming plan and TIP. The decision also held that, among other things, projects that had previously been found to conform and had completed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process ("grandfathered" projects) may not be advanced (that is, such projects should not be approved or funded) in a nonattainment or maintenance area if there is no currently conforming transportation plan and TIP for the area. The court did not rule on the issue of how active right-of-way (ROW) acquisition and design projects