

arrival information and orientation to participants, monitoring of participants, proper maintenance and security of forms, record-keeping, reporting and other requirements. The Grantee will be responsible for issuing DS-2019 forms to participants in this program.

A copy of the complete regulations governing the administration of Exchange Visitor (J) programs is available at <http://exchanges.state.gov> or from: United States Department of State, Office of Exchange Coordination and Designation, ECA/EC/ECD-SA-44, Room 734, 301 4th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20547, Telephone: (202) 401-9810, FAX: (202) 401-9809.

**Review Process:** The Bureau will acknowledge receipt of all proposals and will review them for technical eligibility. Proposals will be deemed ineligible if they do not fully adhere to the guidelines stated herein and in the Solicitation Package. All eligible proposals will be reviewed by the program office, as well as the Public Diplomacy section overseas, where appropriate. 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 and ability to achieve program objectives:** 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. Objectives should be reasonable, feasible, and flexible. Proposals should clearly demonstrate how the institution will meet the program's objectives and plan.

3. **Impact/Follow-on activities:** Proposed programs should strengthen long-term mutual understanding, including maximum sharing of information and establishment of long-term institutional and individual

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

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 Record and Capacity:** Proposed personnel and institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program or project's goals. 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.

6. **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 to use 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.

7. **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.

**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: May 6, 2004.

**C. Miller Crouch,**

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

[FR Doc. 04-10887 Filed 5-12-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710-05-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Office of the Secretary

#### Aviation Proceedings, Agreements Filed the Week Ending April 30, 2004

The following Agreements were filed with the Department of Transportation under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 412 and 414. Answers may be filed within 21 days after the filing of the application.

**Docket Number:** OST-2004-17628.

**Date Filed:** April 26, 2004.

**Parties:** Members of the International Air Transport Association.

**Subject:** MV/PSC/007 dated 18 March, 2004, Mail Vote Number S 078, Necessary Amendments to PSC Standards to Reflect Changes to EC Antitrust Enforcement Procedures r1 to r30, Intended effective date: 1 May 2004.

**Docket Number:** OST-2004-17630.

**Date Filed:** April 26, 2004.

**Parties:** Members of the International Air Transport Association.

**Subject:** MV/PSC/008 dated 22 March 2004, Mail Vote Number S 079, Recommended Practice 1724—General Conditions of Carriage, Changes to Better Reflect the Montreal Convention 1999 (r1), Intended effective date: 1 June 2004.

**Docket Number:** OST-2004-17669.

*Date Filed:* April 29, 2004.

*Parties:* Members of the International Air Transport Association.

*Subject:* Mail Vote 369—Resolution 010p, TC31 North and Central Pacific, Special Passenger Amending Resolution from Korea (Rep. of) to USA r1, Intended effective date: 15 May 2004.

*Docket Number:* OST–2004–17670.

*Date Filed:* April 29, 2004.

*Parties:* Members of the International Air Transport Association.

*Subject:* Mail Vote 372 Resolution 010t, TC31 North and Central Pacific, Special Passenger Amending Resolution from Philippines to Canada, USA r-1, Intended effective date: 15 May 2004.

**Andrea M. Jenkins,**

*Program Manager, Docket Operations, Federal Register Liaison.*

[FR Doc. 04–10811 Filed 5–12–04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–62–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Office of the Secretary

#### Drug Testing Procedures

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary (OST), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Informational Notice: HHS Drug Testing Proposals.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Transportation (DOT) is issuing this notice to call to the attention of employers, employees, testing service agents, and other interested persons in its transportation industry drug testing program a notice proposing important new Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) drug testing procedures. Because of the close relationship between HHS and DOT drug testing procedures, participants in the DOT transportation industry drug testing program should be aware of important issues that HHS is considering, which may later affect the DOT testing program.

*Comment Closing Date:* HHS is considering comments on its proposal through July 12, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the HHS proposal should be sent directly to HHS. The following are HHS' instructions to commenters on how and where to submit comments:

You may submit comments, identified by Docket Number 04–7984, by any of the following methods:

- *E-mail:* [wvogl@samhsa.gov](mailto:wvogl@samhsa.gov). Include docket number and/or RIN number in the subject line of the message.
- *Fax:* (301) 443–3031.

- *Mail:* 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockwall II, Suite 815, Rockville, Maryland 20857.

- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* 5515 Security Lane, Suite 815, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

- *Information Collection*

*Requirements:* Submit comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB, New Executive Office Building, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20502, Attn: Desk Officer for SAMHSA. Because of delays in receipt of mail, comments may also be sent to (202) 95–6974 (fax).

- *Instructions:* All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) for this rulemaking. All comments will be available for public review at 5515 Security Lane, Suite 815, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The HHS informational contact on this rulemaking is Walter F. Vogl, Ph.D., Drug Testing Section, Division of Workplace Programs, CSAP, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockwall II, Suite 815, Rockville, Maryland 20857, (301) 443–6014 (voice), (301) 443–3031 (fax), [wvogl@samhsa.gov](mailto:wvogl@samhsa.gov) (e-mail). The DOT contacts on drug testing procedure issues are Jim Swart, Acting Director, Office of Drug and Alcohol Policy Compliance, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington DC 20590, phone (202) 366–3784; e-mail [jim.swart@ost.dot.gov](mailto:jim.swart@ost.dot.gov); and Robert C. Ashby, Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulation and Enforcement, same address, phone (202) 366–9310; e-mail [bob.ashby@ost.dot.gov](mailto:bob.ashby@ost.dot.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has issued an important notice proposing to revise its Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing programs [69 FR 19673; April 13, 2004]. Interested persons may access the HHS document on the Internet at the following URL: <http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/14mar20010800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2004/pdf/04-7984.pdf>. In their summary of the document HHS states, “The Department of Health and Human Services is proposing to establish scientific and technical guidelines for the testing of hair, sweat, and oral fluid specimens in addition to urine specimens; scientific and technical guidelines for using on-site tests to test urine and oral fluid at the collection site; requirements for the certification of instrumented initial test facilities; and added standards for

collectors, on-site testers, and medical review officers.”

This HHS proposal does not propose to amend the drug testing requirements and procedures that apply to the Department of Transportation drug testing program for DOT-regulated industries (49 CFR Part 40). Nevertheless, we believe that employers, employees, and testing service providers involved in the DOT testing program should be aware of the HHS notice. We recommend that DOT program participants review the HHS proposals and, if they have views or concerns to express, comment on the notice to HHS. The reason for this suggestion is that there is a close relationship between the HHS Mandatory Guidelines and the DOT testing procedures in 49 CFR Part 40.

Part 40, first issued in 1988, incorporated the substance of original HHS Guidelines, adapting the HHS provisions to the transportation workplace. In 1991, Congress enacted the Omnibus Transportation Employee Testing Act. This statute recognized the existing close relationship between the HHS guidelines and Part 40. The statute requires DOT to “incorporate” the HHS guidelines and amendments to them into DOT testing procedures, while leaving DOT sufficient authority to tailor its own program. Because of this statutorily recognized relationship between these guidelines and Part 40, any HHS final rule resulting from its current proposal, while not directly regulating transportation industry employers, will necessarily have to be considered by the Department of Transportation in the context of potential future revisions to Part 40.

We urge interested persons to read the HHS document carefully and to provide any comments directly to the HHS Docket.

Issued this 5th day of May, 2004, at Washington DC.

**Jim L. Swart,**

*Acting Director, Office of Drug and Alcohol Policy and Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 04–10810 Filed 5–12–04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–62–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Transport Airplane and Engine Issues—New Task

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