

consist of a two to three page narrative describing the research project objectives, the approach to be taken, a description of any research partnerships, the duration, and an annual cost estimate.

#### Merit Review

Applications will be subjected to scientific merit review (peer review) and will be evaluated against the following evaluation criteria listed in descending order of importance as codified at 10 CFR 605.10(d):

1. Scientific and/or Technical Merit of the Project,
2. Appropriateness of the Proposed Method or Approach,
3. Competency of Applicant's Personnel and Adequacy of Proposed Resources,
4. Reasonableness and Appropriateness of the Proposed Budget.

The evaluation of applications under item 1, Scientific and Technical Merit, will pay particular attention to:

- (a) The potential of the proposed project to make a significant impact in operating systems and runtime research.
- (b) The demonstrated capabilities of the applicants to perform basic research related to operating systems/runtime and transform these research results into software that can be widely deployed.
- (c) The likelihood that the methodologies and software components that result from this effort will have a substantial impact on the operating system research and vendor community outside of the projects.

The evaluation under item 2, Appropriateness of the Proposed Method or Approach, will also consider the following elements related to Quality of Planning:

- (a) Quality of the plan for effective coupling of operating system and runtime research, with application needs and transition to testbed environments.
- (b) Quality and clarity of proposed work schedule and deliverables.
- (c) Quality of the proposed approach to intellectual property management and open source licensing.

Note that external peer reviewers are selected with regard to both their scientific expertise and the absence of conflict-of-interest issues. Non-federal reviewers may be used, and submission of an application constitutes agreement that this is acceptable to the investigator(s) and the submitting institution. Reviewers will be selected to represent expertise in the technology areas proposed, applications groups that are potential users of the technology,

and related programs in other Federal Agencies or parts of DOE, such as the Advanced Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI) within DOE's National Nuclear Security Administration.

Information about the development and submission of applications, eligibility, limitations, evaluation, selection process, and other policies and procedures including detailed procedures for submitting applications from multi-institution partnerships may be found in 10 CFR part 605, and in the Application Guide for the Office of Science Financial Assistance Program. Electronic access to the Guide and required forms is made available via the World Wide Web at: <http://www.science.doe.gov/production/grants/grants.html>. The Project Description must be 20 pages or less, including tables and figures, but exclusive of attachments. The application must contain an abstract or project summary, letters of intent from collaborators, and short vitae.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this program is 81.049, and the solicitation control number is ERFAP 10 CFR part 605.

Issued in Washington, DC on March 10, 2004.

**Martin Rubinstein,**

*Acting Director, Grants and Contracts Division, Office of Science.*

[FR Doc. 04-5997 Filed 3-16-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[AK-04-001; FRL-7637-6]

### Adequacy Status of the Anchorage, Alaska Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of adequacy determination.

**SUMMARY:** In this action, EPA is notifying the public that we have found that the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the Anchorage, Alaska Serious Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plan, submitted by the Governor on February 18, 2004, are adequate for conformity purposes. On March 2, 1999, the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that submitted State Implementation Plans (SIPs) cannot be used for conformity determinations until EPA has affirmatively found them adequate. As a result of our finding, the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska

Department of Transportation & Public Facilities, and the U.S. Department of Transportation are required to use the motor vehicle emissions budgets in this submitted maintenance plan for future transportation conformity determinations.

**DATES:** This finding is effective April 1, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The finding will be available at EPA's conformity Web site: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/transp/conform/adequacy.htm>. You may also contact Wayne Elson, U.S. EPA, Region 10 (OAQ-107), 1200 Sixth Ave, Seattle WA 98101; (206) 553-1463 or [elson.wayne@epa.gov](mailto:elson.wayne@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Today's notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region 10 sent a letter to The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation on March 5, 2004, stating that the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the Maintenance Plan for the Serious Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Area for Anchorage are adequate.

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA's conformity rule requires transportation plans, programs, and projects to conform to SIPs and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which we determine whether a SIP's motor vehicle emission budget is adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA's completeness review.

We have described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in guidance (May 14, 1999 memo titled "Conformity Guidance on Implementation of March 2, 1999 Conformity Court Decision"). We followed this guidance in making our adequacy determination.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: March 8, 2004.

**L. John Iani,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 10.*

[FR Doc. 04-6000 Filed 3-16-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**