

additional 60 days and also requested a public hearing. KCS replied to these petitions stating in essence that petitioners had not provided sufficient reason why the 45-day comment period was inadequate.

In carefully reviewing CCAP's concerns, as well as those expressed by other parties, SEA believes that the 45-day comment period specified by CEQ guidelines is sufficient in this case. However, in order to allow every opportunity for public input into the Board's NEPA process in this case, SEA will accept comments to the draft EIS for an additional 15 days past the current due date of September 8, 1997. Comments to the draft EIS will now be due on September 23, 1997.

If you wish to file comments on the draft EIS, send an original and 10 copies to: Vernon A. Williams, Secretary, Surface Transportation Board, Suite 700, 1925 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20423. Mark the lower left corner of the envelope: Attention: Michael Dalton, Environmental Comments, Finance Docket No. 32530.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael Dalton, Section of Environmental Analysis, Room 528, Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20423; phone number (202) 565-1530. TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 565-1695.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Because the Board served the draft EIS on the parties of record on July 16, 1997 and the 45-day comment period did not begin until the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published the Notice of EIS Availability in the **Federal Register** on July 25, 1997, the actual total time between the service and distribution of the draft EIS and the end of the comment period is 55 days. The additional 15-day extension results in a 70-day comment period.

In addition, CEQ guidelines and the Board's environmental rules do not require a public hearing to solicit comments on a draft EIS. SEA believes that the submission of written comments, which is the Board's normal procedure, is sufficient to develop the record in this case. In this regard, the Board has found that written comments provide necessary and effective written documentation of environmental issues and concerns for our public record.

By the Board, Elaine K. Kaiser, Chief, Section of Environmental Analysis.

**Vernon A. Williams,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-23462 Filed 9-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Fiscal Service

#### Fee Schedule for the Service to the TREASURY DIRECT Investor of Selling Securities Held in TREASURY DIRECT Accounts in the Secondary Market

**AGENCY:** Bureau of the Public Debt, Fiscal Service, Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Treasury is announcing the schedule of fees to be charged to the TREASURY DIRECT investor for the service of selling unmatured securities held in TREASURY DIRECT in the secondary market. The service will be provided by a designated Federal Reserve Bank acting as fiscal agent of the United States.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** September 4, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Richard Koch, Director, Division of Customer Service, Bureau of the Public Debt, (304) 480-6748; Susan Klimas, Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, (304) 480-5192; Edward C. Gronseth, Deputy Chief Counsel, Office of the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, (304) 480-5192.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On September 4, 1997, the Department of the Treasury amended the general regulations governing book-entry Treasury Bonds, Notes and Bills to offer TREASURY DIRECT investors the service of selling their unmatured marketable securities held in their TREASURY DIRECT accounts in the secondary market. At the request of the investor, the securities will be transferred to the designated Federal Reserve Bank, acting as fiscal agent of the United States, to be sold on behalf of the investor.

A transaction fee will be charged for each security sold on behalf of the investor. For purposes of computing the transaction fee, a security is considered as any amount within a TREASURY DIRECT account which is identified by a separate CUSIP number. Thus, if an investor has several holdings within a TREASURY DIRECT account of varying amounts, but all are identified by the same CUSIP number, and all are transferred in one transaction, only one transaction fee will be charged, since the holdings are considered as one security. If the investor has several holdings within a TREASURY DIRECT account, each with a different CUSIP number, then a separate transaction fee will be charged for each holding, as each holding with a separate CUSIP

number is considered a separate security. If an investor has two TREASURY DIRECT accounts, and each account has a security with a CUSIP identical to the security in the other account, then a separate transaction fee will be charged for each security, since each security within each account is considered a separate security. If the Federal Reserve Bank is unable to complete the sale of the security, no transaction fee will be charged. The transaction fee will be deducted from the settlement amount by the Federal Reserve Bank.

#### Schedule of Fees for the Sale of Securities in the Secondary Market

The fee schedule for the sale of an unmatured security held in TREASURY DIRECT by the designated Federal Reserve Bank in the secondary market on behalf of the investor is as follows: a fee of \$34 will be charged for each security held in a TREASURY DIRECT account which is sold in the secondary market on behalf of the investor by the designated Federal Reserve Bank acting as fiscal agent of the United States.

Dated: August 29, 1997.

**Richard L. Gregg,**

*Commissioner of the Public Debt.*

[FR Doc. 97-23570 Filed 9-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-39-M

## UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

### Training Programs for Slovakia, Slovenia, Bosnia/Croatia/Serbia, the Baltics and Poland

**ACTION:** Request for proposals.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Citizen Exchanges of the United States Information Agency's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs announces an open competition for an assistance award. Public and private non-profit organizations meeting the provisions described in IRS regulation 26 CFR 1.501(c) may apply to develop training programs that link their international exchange interests in Central and Eastern Europe with counterpart institutions/groups in ways supportive of the aims of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. 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 Fulbright-Hays Act.

Programs and projects must conform with Agency requirements and guidelines outlined in the Solicitation Package. USIA projects and programs are subject to the availability of funds.

**Announcement Title and Number:** All communications with USIA concerning this RFP should refer to the announcement's title and reference number E/P-98-04.

**Deadline for Proposals:** All copies must be received at the U.S. Information Agency by 5 p.m. Washington, DC time on Friday, November 14, 1997. Faxed documents will not be accepted at any time. Documents postmarked by the due date but received at a later date will not be accepted. Grants may begin on March 1, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The Office of Citizens Exchange, E/PE, Room 220, U.S. Information Agency, 301 4th Street SW., Washington, DC 20547, telephone: 202-619-5319; fax: 202-619-4350; Internet Address: {cminer@usia.gov} to request a Solicitation Package containing more detailed forms, and standard guidelines for preparing proposals, including specific criteria for preparation of the proposal budget.

**To Download a Solicitation Package Via Internet:** The entire Solicitation Package may be downloaded from USIA's website at <http://www.usia.gov/education/rfps>. Please read all information before downloading.

**To Receive a Solicitation Package Via Fax on Demand:** The entire Solicitation Package may be received via the Bureau's "Grants Information Fax on Demand System", which is accessed by calling 202/401-7616. Please request a "Catalog" of available documents and order numbers when first entering the system.

Please specify USIA Program Officer Christina Miner on all inquiries and correspondences. Interested applicants should read the complete **Federal Register** announcement before sending inquiries or submitting proposals. Once the RFP deadline has passed, Agency staff may not discuss this competition in any way with applicants until the

Bureau proposal review process has been completed.

**Submissions:** Applicants must follow all instructions given in the Solicitation Package. The original and ten copies of the application should be sent to: U.S. Information Agency, Ref.: E/P-98-04, Office of Grants Management, E/XE, Room 326, 301 4th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20547.

Applicants must also submit the "Executive Summary" and "Proposal Narrative" sections of the proposal on a 3.5" diskette, formatted for DOS. This material must be provided in ASCII text (DOS) format with a maximum line length of 65 characters. USIA will transmit these files electronically to USIS posts overseas for their review, with the goal of reducing the time it takes to get posts' comments for the Agency's grants review process.

#### **Diversity, Freedom and Democracy Guidelines**

Pursuant to the Bureau's authorizing legislation, programs must maintain a non-political character and should be balanced and representative of the diversity of American political, social, and cultural life. "Diversity" should be interpreted in the broadest sense and encompass differences including, but not limited to ethnicity, race, gender, religion, geographic location, socio-economic status, and physical challenges. Applicants are strongly encouraged to adhere to the advancement of this principle both in program administration and in program content. Please refer to the review criteria under the "Support for Diversity" section for specific suggestions on incorporating diversity into the total proposal. Public Law 104-319 provides that "in carrying out programs of educational and cultural exchange in countries whose people do not fully enjoy freedom and democracy", USIA "shall take appropriate steps to provide opportunities for participation in such programs to human rights and democracy leaders of such countries." Proposals should account for advancement of this goal in their program contents, to the full extent deemed feasible.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Diminished resources have forced USIA to limit the scope of this announcement; regrettably, proposals for countries and themes other than the ones described below will not be eligible for consideration.

USIA is interested in proposals in the following areas and countries:

**Slovakia:** Projects should focus on the free-flow of information for Slovak

libraries. Objectives of the project would be to introduce the practical use of new technologies and new library services for citizens. There is particular interest in assisting the parliamentary library to become a source of information about the parliament and lawmaking for the whole country and not just a research service for its members. In addition, Slovak partners should include the librarian's association and leading university and public libraries, particularly Bratislava's University Library. Proposals for less than \$110,000 will receive preference. Costs of up to \$10,000 may be used to cover equipment purchases and subscriptions to the Internet.

**Slovenia:** Projects should focus on municipal administration and devolving greater administrative power from the federal level to municipalities. The first phase of the project should consist of in-country workshops for mayors from many of the 147 counties or "opcina" in Slovenia. Workshop topics could include how local governments raise revenue, economic development for municipalities and the provision of municipal services. During the second phase of the project six to eight mayors should participate in a U.S. study tour which would include site visits to municipal governments in small to medium sized cities. Proposals for less than \$75,000 will receive preference.

**Bosnia/Croatia/Serbia:** Proposals for this multi-country project should focus on the themes of diversity in a democracy, the protection of minority rights, and human rights law. The first phase of the project would consist of in-country workshops held in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia for 20 to 30 participants in each country. The workshops may be held outside of the capital cities. Phase two should be a U.S. program for approximately three participants from each country. Proposals for less than \$75,000 will be given preference.

**Estonia/Latvia/Lithuania:** Proposals for this multi-country project should focus on intellectual property rights (IPR), with a special concentration on copyright protection for films/videos, music recordings, computer software, and similar products subject to piracy. Participants should include: (1) Government officials responsible both for drafting and enforcing laws and regulations; (2) lawyers, judges and distributors or licensing organizations involved with presenting and deciding infringement cases; and (3) press and media, to engage them in raising public consciousness about IPR protection. The first phase of the project would bring U.S. project staff to Estonia, Latvia and

Lithuania in order to become familiar with the particular legal regime and market environment in each country and to meet with the principal players in the copyright enforcement arena. Project staff would also familiarize themselves with the efforts of organizations such as the WTO, EU Phare, WIPO, and embassy elements that are already working in the area.

The second phase of the project would include one to two day training workshops in each country. The workshops would consist of seminars for customs officers on techniques for identifying and seizing infringing goods; for lawyers and judges on the elements of proving infringement, damages and remedies allowed by statute; and the licensees, copyright owners and media representatives on informing the public about the value of protecting copyrights. A final workshop component should bring the above groups of people together to facilitate understanding of the full scope of the issue and to develop an effective solution to issues of piracy. The third phase of the project would be a U.S. training program for a selected group of participants. Participants would receive first-hand exposure to piracy investigation techniques, customs inspection practices, licensing policies of collective rights organizations, preparation and presentation of a case in court, public relations strategies and related IPR enforcement and protection endeavors. Projects for less than \$100,000 will receive preference.

**Poland:** Projects should consist of two parts. Part one should focus on intellectual property rights and copyright law. Participants should be representatives of both large and small Polish presses. The second part should focus on economic survival techniques for small press operations. Participants should include representatives of Poland's small, serious presses. The project goals should be to foster better respect of intellectual property rights in Poland and to help serious, small presses survive in Poland's free market economy. Projects for less than \$90,000 will receive preference.

Exchange and training programs supported by institutional grants should operate at two levels: They should enhance institutional relationships; and they should offer practical and comparative information to individuals to assist them with their professional responsibilities. Strong proposals usually have the following characteristics: An existing partner relationship between an American organization and a host-country institution; a proven track record of

conducting program activity; cost sharing from American or in-country sources, including donations of air fares, hotel and housing costs; experienced staff with language facility; and a clear, convincing plan showing how permanent results will be accomplished as a result of the activity funded by the grant. USIA wants to see tangible forms of time and money contributed to the project by the prospective grantee institution, as well as funding from third party sources.

**Note:** Research projects or projects limited to technical issues are not eligible for support nor are film festivals or exhibits. Exchange programs for students or faculty or proposals that request support for the development of university curricula or for degree-based programs are also ineligible under this RFP. Proposals to link university departments or to exchange faculty and/or students are funded by USIA's Office of Academic Programs (E/A) under the University Affiliation Program and should not be submitted in response to this RFP.

#### Guidelines

1. All grant proposals must clearly describe the type of persons who will participate in the program as well as the process by which participants will be selected. In the selection of all foreign participants, USIA and USIS posts retain the right to nominate participants and to approve or reject participants recommended by the program institution. Programs must also comply with J-1 visa regulations.

2. Programs that include internships in the U.S. should provide letters tentatively committing host institutions to support the internships. Letters of commitment from the hosts of study tour site visits should also be included, if applicable.

3. Applicants are encouraged to consult with USIS offices regarding program content and partner institutions before submitting proposals. Award-receiving applicants will be expected to maintain contact with the USIS post throughout the grant period.

#### Proposed Budget

Please refer to the Solicitation Package for complete budget instructions. Applicants must submit a detailed line item budget based on specific instructions in the Program and Budget Guidelines of Proposal Submission Instructions. Proposals for the following amounts will receive preference:

*Slovakia:* \$110,000.

*Slovenia:* \$75,000.

*Croatia/Bosnia/Serbia:* \$75,000.

*Estonia/Latvia/Lithuania:* \$100,000.

*Poland:* \$90,000.

Proposals with strong cost-sharing will be given priority.

Grants awarded to eligible organizations with less than four years of experience in conducting international exchange programs will be limited to \$60,000. Applicants must submit a comprehensive budget for the entire program. There must be a summary budget as well as a breakdown reflecting both the administrative budget and the program budget. For further clarification, applicants may provide separate sub-budgets for each program component, phase, location, or activity in order to facilitate USIA decisions on funding.

Allowable costs for the program include the following:

(1) International and domestic air fares; visas; transit costs; ground transportation costs.

(2) Per Diem. For the U.S. program, organizations have the option of using a flat \$140/day for program participants or the published U.S. Federal per diem rates for individual American cities. For activities outside the U.S., the published Federal per diem rates must be used.

**Note:** U.S. escorting staff must use the published Federal per diem rates, not the flat rate.

(3) Interpreters. If needed, interpreters for the U.S. program are provided by the U.S. State Department Language Services Division. Typically, a pair of simultaneous interpreters is provided for every four visitors. USIA grants do not pay for foreign interpreters to accompany delegations from their home country. Grant proposal budgets should contain a flat \$140/day per diem for each Department of State interpreter, as well as home-program-home air transportation of \$400 per interpreter plus any U.S. travel expenses during the program. Salary expenses are covered centrally and should not be part of an applicant's proposed budget.

(4) Book and cultural allowance. Participants are entitled to and escorts are reimbursed a one-time cultural allowance of \$150 per person, plus a participant book allowance of \$50. U.S. staff do not get these benefits.

(5) Consultants. May be used to provide specialized expertise or to make presentations. Daily honoraria generally do not exceed \$250 per day.

Subcontracting organizations may also be used, in which case the written agreement between the prospective grantee and subcontractor should be included in the proposal.

(6) Room rental, which generally should not exceed \$250 per day.

(7) Materials development. Proposals may contain costs to purchase, develop, and translate materials for participants.

(8) One working meal per project. Per capita costs may not exceed \$5–8 for a lunch and \$14–20 for a dinner, excluding room rental. The number of invited guests may not exceed participants by more than a factor of two-to-one.

(9) All USIA-funded delegates will be covered under the terms of a USIA-sponsored health insurance policy. The premium is paid by USIA directly to the insurance company.

(10) Other costs necessary for the effective administration of the program, including salaries for grant organization employees, benefits, and other direct and indirect costs per detailed instructions in the application package.

#### Review Process

USIA 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.

Eligible proposals will be forwarded to panels of USIA officers for advisory review. All eligible proposals will be reviewed by the program office, as well as the USIA Office of East European and Newly Independent States Affairs and the USIA post overseas, where appropriate. Proposals may be reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel or by other Agency elements. Funding decisions are at the discretion of the USIA Associate Director for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Final technical authority for assistance awards (grants or cooperative agreements) resides with the USIA 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. Program planning ability to achieve objectives:** Program objectives should be stated clearly and precisely and should reflect the applicant's expertise in the subject area and the region. Objectives should respond to the priority topics in this announcement and should relate to

the current conditions in each of the countries. They should be reasonable and attainable. A detailed work plan should explain step by step how objectives will be achieved. The substance of seminars, presentations, consulting, internships, and itineraries should be spelled out in detail. A timetable indicating when major program tasks will be undertaken should be provided. Responsibilities of in-country partners should be clearly described.

**2. 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).

**3. Institutional Capacity:** Proposed personnel and institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program or project's goals. The narrative should demonstrate proven ability to handle logistics. Proposal should reflect the institution's expertise in the subject area and knowledge of the country. Proposals should demonstrate the institutional record of successful exchange programs, including responsible fiscal management and full compliance with all reporting requirements for past Agency grants as determined by USIA's Office of Contracts. The Agency will consider the past performance of prior recipients and the demonstrated potential of new applicants.

**4. Project Evaluation:** USIA is results-oriented. Proposals should include a plan to evaluate the activity's success, both as the activities unfold and at the end of the program. USIA recommends that the proposal include a draft survey questionnaire and/or plan for use of another measurement technique (such as focus group) to link outcomes to original project objectives. Award-receiving organizations/institutions will be expected to submit intermediate reports after each project component is

concluded or quarterly, whichever is less frequent.

**5. Follow-on Activities:** Proposals should provide a plan for continued follow-on activity (without USIA support) which ensures that USIA supported programs are not isolated events.

**6. 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.

#### Notice

The terms and conditions published in this RFP are binding and may not be modified by any USIA representative. Explanatory information provided by the Agency that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of the RFP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the Government. The Agency 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. Organizations will be expected to cooperate with USIA in evaluating their programs under the principles of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, which requires federal agencies to measure and report on the results of their programs and activities.

#### Notification

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

Dated: September 28, 1997.

**James D. Whitten,**

*Acting Deputy Associate Director for Educational and Cultural Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 97-23432 Filed 9-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8230-01-M