

## 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. Proposals should display an understanding of the goals of the program, as reflected in the priorities of this RFGP. Exchange activities should ensure efficient use of program resources. Proposals should demonstrate a commitment to excellence and creativity in the implementation and management of the program.

2. *Program planning:* A detailed agenda and relevant work plan should explain how objectives will be achieved and should include a timetable for completion of major tasks. Responsibilities of partnering organizations should be clearly described.

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 goals and plan. The substance of workshops and exchange activities should be described in detail and included as an attachment.

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 schools and participants, program venue and program evaluation) and program content. Applicants should refer to the Bureau's Diversity, Freedom and Democracy Guidelines in the Proposal Submission Instructions (PSI).

5. *Institutional Capacity/Record/Ability:* Applicants should demonstrate knowledge of each country's educational environment and the capacity to recruit U.S. and foreign students. Proposals should present significant experience in developing exchange or intern programs and exhibit an institutional record of successful exchange programs, including responsible fiscal management and full compliance with all reporting requirements as determined by the Bureau's Grants Division. Proposed personnel and institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program goals and objectives.

6. *Multiplier Effect/Impact:* The program should strengthen long-term mutual understanding and facilitate

leadership development. Applicants should detail how participants will share newly-acquired knowledge and skills with others.

7. *Program Monitoring and Evaluation:* Proposals must include a plan and methodology to evaluate the program's successes and challenges, both as the activities unfold and at the end of the program. The evaluation plan should show a clear link between program objectives and expected outcomes, and should include a description of performance indicators and measurement tools. Applicants should provide draft questionnaires or other techniques for use in surveying participants to facilitate the demonstration of results. The grantee organization will indicate its willingness to submit periodic progress reports in accordance with the program office's expectations.

8. *Follow-on and Sustainability:* Proposals should provide a strategy for the use of alumni to work together to further the impact of the program without the Bureau's financial support.

9. *Cost-effectiveness/Cost sharing:* The overhead and administrative components of the proposal, including salaries and honoraria, should be kept as low as possible. While lower "per participant" figures will be more competitive, the Bureau expects all figures to be realistic. 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, Pub. L. 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 the FY04 Exchanges budget.

## 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 20, 2004.

**C. Miller Crouch,**

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

[FR Doc. 04-9440 Filed 4-23-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-05-P

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 4663]

### Advisory Committee on Labor Diplomacy; Notice of Cancellation of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Labor Diplomacy (ACLD) has cancelled its meeting scheduled for Monday, April 26, 2004 at 9 a.m. in room 1107, U.S. Department of State, 2201 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20520. The meeting has been postponed until further notice.

Dated: April 21, 2004.

**Robert Hogan,**

*Director, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 04-9528 Filed 4-23-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-18-P

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 4659]

### U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy; Notice of Meeting

A meeting of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy will be held at the U.S. Consulate in Shanghai, China, on May 17, 2004 at 10 a.m. The Commissioners will discuss public diplomacy in Asia.

The Commission was reauthorized pursuant to Pub. L. 106-113 (H.R. 3194, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000). The U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy is a bipartisan presidentially appointed panel created

by Congress in 1948 to provide oversight of U.S. Government activities intended to understand, inform and influence foreign publics. The Commission reports its findings and recommendations to the President, the Congress, the Secretary of State and the American people. Current Commission members include Barbara M. Barrett of Arizona, who is the Chairman; Harold C. Pachios of Maine; Ambassador Penne Percy Korth of Washington, DC; Ambassador Elizabeth F. Bagley of Washington, DC; Charles "Tre" Evers III of Florida; Jay T. Snyder of New York; and Maria Sophia Aguirre of Washington, DC.

For more information, please contact Matt J. Lauer at (202) 203-7880.

Dated: April 15, 2004.

**Matthew J. Lauer,**

*Executive Director, U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 04-9439 Filed 4-23-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-11-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Finding of No Significant Impact

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Environmental Finding Document: Finding No Significant Impact; Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the East Kern Airport District (EKAD) proposal to operate a commercial launch facility at the Mojave Airport in Mojave, California. The EA also evaluated the potential environmental impacts of launching two types of horizontally launched suborbital vehicles (Concept A and Concept B) proposed to be launched from the Mojave Airport. XCOR Aerospace is requesting a launch specific license and proposes to conduct up to 10 licensed launches in 2005 and up to 25 licensed launches in 2006 of the Sphinx launch vehicle. This launch vehicle is similar to the Concept B vehicle described and analyzed in the EA. After reviewing and analyzing currently available data and information on existing conditions, project impacts, and measures to mitigate those impacts, the FAA, Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation (AST) has determined that licensing up to 35 launches of the

Sphinx vehicle is not a Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Therefore the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required and AST is issuing a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). The FAA made this determination in accordance with all applicable environmental laws.

*For a Copy of the Environmental Assessment or the FONSI Contact:* Ms. Michon Washington, FAA Environmental Specialist, Mojave Airport EA, c/o ICF Consulting, 9300 Lee Highway, Fairfax, VA 22031, or refer to the following Internet address: <http://ast.faa.gov>.

**DATES:** The Draft EA was released for public comment on October 31, 2003. In addition, the FAA held a public hearing on December 10, 2003 in Mojave, California to collect comments from the public. All comments received before December 12, 2003 were considered in the preparation of the Final EA.

*Proposed Action:* Launches of launch vehicles, such as XCOR's proposed launches of the Sphinx vehicle from the Mojave Airport, must be licensed by the FAA pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 70101-70121, formerly the Commercial Space Launch Act. Licensing the launch of a launch vehicle is a Federal action requiring environmental analysis by the FAA in accordance with NEPA of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.* Upon receipt of a complete license application, AST must decide whether to issue a launch license to XCOR for up to 35 launches of the Sphinx launch vehicle from the Mojave Airport. An environmental determination is required for the evaluation of a license application.

The FAA is using the analyses in the Final EA as the basis for the environmental determination of the impacts of these launches to support the licensing decision for the launch of the Sphinx vehicle from the Mojave Airport.

Concept B launch vehicles considered in the EA would use rocket power to take off from a standard aviation runway. This is the same type of operation proposed for operating the Sphinx launch vehicle. The EA considers the overall impacts to the environment of the proposed operations including the launch and landing of Concept B launch vehicles at the Mojave Airport. The EA considered both a small Concept B launch vehicle, which would use approximately 476 kilograms (1,050 pounds) of propellant and a large Concept B launch vehicle, which would use approximately 4,763 kilograms

(10,500 pounds) of propellant. The Sphinx vehicle is similar to the small Concept B vehicle described and analyzed in the EA.

The Sphinx vehicle would consist of a single stage rocket power vehicle, powered by an engine fueled by liquid oxygen (LOX) and kerosene. The vehicle would launch horizontally from a runway at Mojave Airport and would likely fly east along a steep ascent trajectory until the propellants are expended. The vehicle would coast unpowered along a parabolic trajectory until reaching apogee. It would then coast down until pullout and glide to an emergency-management area between 10 and 160 kilometers (six and 100 miles) downrange of the Mojave Airport where it may be necessary to conduct a series of maneuvers to expend excess energy before making a descent to the Mojave Airport. Upon reaching the Mojave Airport it may be necessary to conduct additional maneuvers to expend excess energy before performing an unpowered horizontal landing.

In the unlikely event of an emergency landing, the Pilot in Command (PIC) would attempt to reach the primary abort site at the main runway at Edwards Air Force Base. However, any airport within gliding range with a runway at least 1,219 meters (4,000 feet) long would be a candidate for an emergency landing location.

#### Environmental Impacts

##### *Safety and Health*

A hazard analysis is a necessary part of the Mission and Safety Review for the FAA licensing determination to assess the possible hazards associated with proposed ground, flight, and landing operations. Launches of the Sphinx launch vehicle from the Mojave Airport would require launch specific licenses from the FAA and the launch applicant would be required to conduct risk analyses based on the proposed mission profiles. The Mission and Safety Review will consider these analyses and, therefore, they were not discussed in detail in the EA. However, analysis of the safety and health implications of launch related operations and activities that have the potential for environmental impact were considered in the EA.

There would be some vapors of various propellants released from propellant storage/transfer operations through evaporative losses. However, such vapors would be vented outside and at a height that would provide adequate protection for personnel, buildings, and the environment. Also, the total quantity of emissions would