eligible fields. Project objectives should relate clearly to institutional and societal needs.

*(2) Creativity and Feasibility of Strategy to Achieve Project Objectives:* Strategies to achieve project objectives should be feasible and realistic within the projected budget and timeframe. These strategies should utilize and reinforce exchange activities creatively to ensure an efficient use of program resources. Relevant factors include: the availability of a sufficient number of faculty and/or administrators willing and able to participate in project activities, and faculty and/or administrators with Arabic or French language skills.

*(3) Institutional Commitment to Cooperation:* Proposals should demonstrate significant understanding by each institution of its own needs and capacities and of the needs and capacities of its proposed partner(s), together with a strong commitment by the partner institutions, during and after the period of grant activity, to cooperate with one another in the mutual pursuit of institutional objectives. Proposals should describe projected benefits to the institutions involved as well as to wider communities of educators and practitioners in Algeria or Tunisia.

*(4) Project Evaluation:* Proposals should outline a methodology for determining the degree to which a project meets its objectives, both while the project is underway and at its conclusion. The final project evaluation should include an external component and should provide observations about the project's influence within the participating institutions as well as their surrounding communities or societies, and observations about anticipated long-term impact on the Algerian or Tunisian economy.

*(5) Cost-effectiveness:* Administrative and program costs should be reasonable and appropriate with cost sharing provided by all participating institutions within the context of their respective capacities. We view cost sharing as a reflection of institutional commitment to the project. While there is no rigid ratio of administrative to program costs, priority will be given to proposals whose administrative costs are less than thirty per cent of the total requested from ECA.

*(6) Support of Diversity:* Proposals should demonstrate substantive support of the Bureau's policy on diversity by explaining how issues of diversity are included in project objectives for all institutional partners. Issues resulting from differences of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, geography, socio-economic status, or physical challenge should be addressed during project implementation. In addition, project participants and administrators should reflect the diversity within the societies which they represent (see the section of this document on ''Diversity, Freedom, and Democracy Guidelines''). Proposals should also discuss how the various institutional partners approach diversity issues in their respective communities or societies.

**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 cited above is provided through the U.S. North African Economic Partnership.

## 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: April 16, 2002.

**Rick A. Ruth,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 02–10186 Filed 4–24–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710–05–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Federal Aviation Administration

## [Docket No. FAA–2002–12141]

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA invites public comment on its intent to clarify how Designated Engineering Representatives (DER) are authorized to approve major repair and major alteration data intended for use on foreign-registered aircraft.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by May 18, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kevin Kendall, FAA, Aircraft Certification Service, Aircraft Engineering Division, Delegation and Airworthiness Programs Branch, AIR–140, ARB Room 304, 6500 S. MacArthur Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73169; telephone: (405) 954–7074; fax (405) 954–2209; e-mail *kevin.kendall@faa.gov*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Comments Invited

You are invited to comment on the proposed order by submitting such written data, views, or arguments, as you desire, to the aforementioned specified address. You may examine all comments received on the proposed order before the closing date, in Room 815, FAA Headquarters Building (FOB–10A), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, weekdays except Federal holidays, between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered by the Director of the Aircraft Certification Service before issuing the final order.

### Background

We at the FAA acknowledge that current policy does not fully address DER data approval for major repair and major alternations for foreign-registered aircraft. Lack of specific policy has caused some Aircraft Certification Offices to allow such approvals, while others do not. In certain cases, we concur with DER data approval for major repairs and major alternations on foreign-registered aircraft. We see the need to define what those cases are, and the process for documenting these approvals.

We also understand that DERs and their customers are concerned that our policy may restrict their ability to support the needs of the aviation

industry. We believe that these concerns may be relieved by allowing DERs to approve data for major repairs and major alterations applicable to certain foreign-registered aircraft. In many cases this activity requires a disclaimer be used on the FAA Form 8110–3. We also see a benefit in allowing DERs to approve data for foreign-registered aircraft in instances where the foreign authority has no capability or system for generating the approval. However, this does not mean that any authority must accept DER approved data. Additional background and discussion are provided in the draft order.

**Interim Implementation**

Since the current policy is silent regarding when a DER may approve major repair or major alteration data specifically intended for use on foreign-registered aircraft, implementation of this proposed policy may change a past practice allowed by the FAA. We advise Aircraft Certification Offices to continue their currently established practice until this policy becomes official.

**How To Obtain Copies**

The proposed order will be available on the World Wide Web at *http://av-info.faa.gov/dst/dernotice.htm.* You can also request it from the office listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 18, 2002.

**David W. Hempe,**

*Manager, Aircraft Engineering Division.*

[FR Doc. 02–10180 Filed 4–24–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Highway Administration

### Environmental Impact Statement: Kings & Queens Counties, NY

**AGENCY:** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The FHWA is issuing this Notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared for the rehabilitation or replacement of the Kosciusko Bridge, focusing on a 1.1-mile segment of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) from Morgan Avenue in Kings County to the Long Island Expressway (LIE) interchange in Queens County, both in New York State.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Arnold, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, New York Division, Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building, 7th Floor, Clinton Avenue and North Pearl Street, Albany, New York, 12207 Telephone: (518) 431–4127.

or

Joseph Brown, P.E., Project Director, New York State Department of Transportation, Region 11, Hunters Point Plaza, 47–40 21St Street, Long Island City, New York 11101 Telephone: (718) 482–4683.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FHWA, in cooperation with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that will study and document proposed improvements to the Kosciuszko Bridge, focusing on a 1.1-mile segment of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway (BQE) portion of I–278, from Morgan Avenue in Kings County, to the Long Island Expressway (LIE) interchange in Queens County.

The Kosciuszko Bridge Project will address two primary problems identified with the bridge.

**Traffic and Safety**

The bridge, built in the 1930's, cannot safely carry the present volume of traffic. The bridge's narrow lanes (11 feet), steep grade (4 percent), lack of shoulders, and short merge/weave distances near ramps and interchange do not meet current highway design and safety standards. These design deficiencies, combined with approximately 170,000 vehicles using the bridge each day, result in the bridge operating at or near capacity during the AM and PM peak periods, severe congestion throughout much of the midday, heightened accident rates and the diversion of the highway traffic onto local streets.

**Structural Conditions**

The structural condition of the bridge is deteriorating. A number of interim repairs were completed by NYSDOT in recent years to correct identified problems and to extend the life of the bridge and viaduct. Recent inspections have indicated that, despite these aggressive maintenance efforts, the structural deficiencies are increasing. The frequent maintenance and repair efforts and their associated lane closures, while necessary to maintain the bridge, exacerbate the congestion and traffic diversion problems mentioned above, and do not provide a long-term solution to the structure's underlying problems.

The Alternatives Analysis will consider a wide range of alternatives designed to address these needs. A long list of alternatives will be developed during the public scoping process with input from all stakeholders. Each alternative will be screened for its ability to meet the project's goals and objectives. The most promising alternatives will be forwarded for detailed evaluation in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). These alternatives are expected to fall into one of the following categories: no build; Transportation System Management (TSM); rehabilitation with or without additional capacity; and replacement. The DEIS will assess the effect of the project alternatives on: Traffic and transportation; noise; air and water quality; land use and neighborhood character; recreational, cultural, and historic resources; hazardous waste and visual resources.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed interest in this project. The DEIS will be available for public and agency review and comment.

To insure that the full range of issues related to the proposed action is addressed and all significant issues identified, a series of scoping activities will be conducted. Pre-scoping activities have included open houses, meetings with involved agencies, and presentations to local community boards. The formal scoping process will involve:

1. *Public scoping meetings,* to be held in May 2002, to provide the public with information about the project, and to assist in formulating the scope of the environmental studies in the DEIS. NYSDOT will provide information about the project and the scope of the DEIS. Comments on the project and on the scope of the DEIS will then be received from the public, and NYSDOT personnel will be available to answer questions. The public can submit written comments or give oral comments to an on-site stenographer. Written comments will be received by NYSDOT until 30 days after the date of the last scoping meeting (see addresses below).

2. *Scoping discussions with other agencies,* particularly those with a direct or indirect involvement in the proposed project's corridor and project area.

The public scoping meetings are scheduled as follows:

*Date & Time:* May 14, 2002, 3 p.m. 9 p.m.

*Location:* Martin Luther High School, 60–02 Maspeth Avenue, Maspeth, NY 11378