

Accession Number: 20050706-0176.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. eastern time on Friday, July 22, 2005.

Docket Numbers: ER05-1185-000.
Applicants: New England Power Pool Participants Committee.

Description: The New England Power Pool Participants Committee submits a transmittal letter along with a counterpart signature page of the New England Power Pool Agreement, dated 9/1/71 as amended (second restated NEPOOL agreement) executed by Z-TECH, LLC and a letter from Direct Commodities Trading, Inc. providing notice of the termination of its NEPOOL membership and participation in the New England Market.

Filed Date: 7/1/2005.

Accession Number: 20050706-0149.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. eastern time on Friday, July 22, 2005.

Docket Numbers: ER05-1189-000.
Applicants: Carolina Power & Light Company.

Description: Progress Energy, Inc., on behalf of its subsidiary Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L) d/b/a Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc., submits (1) a network integration transmission service agreement and network operating agreement between CP&L and North Carolina Eastern Municipal Power Agency (NCEMPA), (2) related amendments to the Power Coordination Agreement between CP&L and NCEMPA, and (3) a 2010 Transition Agreement between CP&E and NCEMPA.

Filed Date: 7/1/2005.

Accession Number: 20050706-0174.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. eastern time on Friday, July 22, 2005.

Docket Numbers: ER05-1192-000.
Applicants: Arizona Public Service Company.

Description: Arizona Public Service Company submits revisions to its Open Access Transmission Tariff to comply with Order 2003-C.

Filed Date: 7/1/2005.

Accession Number: 20050708-0174.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. eastern time on Friday, July 22, 2005.

Docket Numbers: ER05-784-001.
Applicants: California Independent System Operator Corporation.

Description: California Independent System Operator Corporation submits its compliance filing pursuant to FERC's 6/3/05 letter order in Docket No ER05-784-000, *et al.*

Filed Date: 7/1/2005.

Accession Number: 20050708-0170.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. eastern time on Friday, July 22, 2005.

Docket Numbers: ER91-569-027, ER01-666-004, ER01-1675-002, ER01-1804-003, ER02-862-004.

Applicants: Entergy Services, Inc.; Entergy Arkansas, Inc.; Entergy Gulf States, Inc.; Entergy Louisiana, Inc.; Entergy Mississippi, Inc.; Entergy New Orleans, Inc.; Entergy Power, Inc.; EWO Marketing, L.P.; Entergy Solutions Supply Ltd.; Warren Power, LLC; Entergy Power Ventures, L.P.

Description: Entergy Services, Inc., on behalf of the above-referenced Entergy Affiliates, reports to the Commission a non material change in status pursuant to the reporting requirements of Order 652.

Filed Date: 7/1/2005.

Accession Number: 20050708-0166.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. eastern time on Friday, July 22, 2005.

Docket Numbers: ER96-719-005.
Applicants: MidAmerican Energy Company.

Description: MidAmerican Energy Company submits additional information concerning its domestic energy affiliates and revised market-based rate tariff sheets that include, among other things, the Commission's change of status reporting requirements in compliance with FERC's 6/1/05 Order, 111 FERC 61,320 (2005).

Filed Date: 7/1/2005.

Accession Number: 20050707-0133.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. eastern time on Friday, July 22, 2005.

Docket Numbers: ER98-2535-005.
Applicants: Hafslund Energy Trading LLC.

Description: Hafslund Energy Trading LLC submits its updated triennial market power report in compliance with the Commission's 5/31/05 Order, 111 FERC 61,295 (2005).

Filed Date: 7/1/2005.

Accession Number: 20050707-0132.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. eastern time on Friday, July 22, 2005.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) on or before 5 p.m. eastern time on the specified comment date. It is not necessary to separately intervene again in a subdocket related to a compliance filing if you have previously intervened in the same docket. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant. In reference to filings initiating a new proceeding, interventions or protests submitted on or before the comment deadline need not be served on persons other than the Applicant.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper, using the FERC Online links at <http://www.ferc.gov>. To facilitate electronic service, persons with Internet access who will eFile a document and/or be listed as a contact for an intervenor must create and validate an eRegistration account using the eRegistration link. Select the eFiling link to log on and submit the intervention or protests.

Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 14 copies of the intervention or protest to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., NE., Washington, DC 20426.

The filings in the above proceedings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the appropriate link in the above list. They are also available for review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an eSubscription link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive e-mail notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please e-mail FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or call (866) 208-3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502-8659.

Linda Mitry,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E5-3800 Filed 7-15-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[AMS-FRL-7939-5]

California State Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Standards; Request for Waiver of Federal Preemption; Opportunity for Public Hearing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of opportunity for public hearing and comment.

SUMMARY: The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has notified EPA that it has adopted amendments to the California on-highway heavy-duty vehicle engine regulations for 2007 and subsequent model year to include new Engine Manufacturer Diagnostics (EMD) requirements. By letter dated March 7, 2005, CARB submitted a request that EPA grant a waiver of preemption under section 209(b) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), 42 U.S.C. 7543(b) for these amendments. This notice announces

that EPA has tentatively scheduled a public hearing concerning California's request and that EPA is accepting written comment on the request.

DATES: EPA has tentatively scheduled a public hearing concerning CARB's request on August 17, 2005 beginning at 10 a.m. EPA will hold a hearing only if a party notifies EPA by August 8, 2005, expressing its interest in presenting oral testimony. By August 12, 2005, any person who plans to attend the hearing should call David Dickinson at (202) 343-9256 to learn if a hearing will be held. If EPA does not receive a request for a public hearing, then EPA will not hold a hearing, and instead consider CARB's request based on written submissions to the docket. Any party may submit written comments by September 26, 2005.

ADDRESSES: EPA will make available for public inspection at the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center written comments received from interested parties, in addition to any testimony given at the public hearing. The official public docket is the collection of materials that is available for public viewing at the Air and Radiation Docket in the EPA Docket Center, (EPA/DC) EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the Air and Radiation Docket is (202) 566-1743. The reference number for this docket is OAR-2005-100. Parties wishing to present oral testimony at the public hearing should provide written notice to David Dickinson at the address noted below. If EPA receives a request for a public hearing, EPA will hold the public hearing at 1310 L St., NW., Washington, DC 20005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Dickinson, Certification and Compliance Division (6405J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460. Telephone: (202) 343-9256, Fax: (202) 343-2804, e-mail address: Dickinson.David@epa.gov. EPA will make available an electronic copy of this Notice on the Office of Transportation and Air Quality's (OTAQ's) homepage (<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/>). Users can find this document by accessing the OTAQ homepage and looking at the path entitled "Regulations." This service is free of charge, except any cost you already incur for Internet

connectivity. Users can also get the official **Federal Register** version of the Notice on the day of publication on the primary Web site: (<http://www.epa.gov/docs/fedrgstr/EPA-AIR/>).

Please note that due to differences between the software used to develop the documents and the software into which the documents may be downloaded, changes in format, page length, etc., may occur. Parties wishing to present oral testimony at the public hearing should provide written notice to David Dickinson at: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., (6405J), Washington, DC 20460. Telephone: (202) 343-9256.

Docket: An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA's electronic public docket and comment system. You may use EPA dockets at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket/> to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Although a part of the official docket, the public docket, the public docket does not include Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Once in the edocket system, select "search," then key in the appropriate docket ID number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

(A) Background and Discussion

Section 209(a) of the Clean Air Act, as amended ("Act"), 42 U.S.C. 7543(a), provides:

No State or any political subdivision thereof shall adopt or attempt to enforce any standard relating to the control of emissions from new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines subject to this part. No state shall require certification, inspection or any other approval relating to the control of emissions from any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine as condition precedent to the initial retail sale, titling (if any), or registration of such motor vehicle, motor vehicle engine, or equipment.

Section 209(b)(1) of the Act requires the Administrator, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, to waive application of the prohibitions of section 209(a) for any state that has adopted standards (other than crankcase emission standards) for the control of emissions from new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines prior to March 30, 1966, if the state determines that the state standards will be, in the aggregate, at least as protective of public health and welfare as applicable federal standards. California is the only state that is qualified to seek and receive a waiver under section 209(b). The

Administrator must grant a waiver unless he finds that (A) the determination of the state is arbitrary and capricious, (B) the state does not need the state standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions, or (C) the state standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are not consistent with section 202(a) of the Act.

CARB's March 7, 2005 letter to the Administrator notified EPA that it had adopted amendments to its heavy-duty vehicle engine program. These amendments are to title 13, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 1971. This regulation, as well as other California regulations, define an on-road, heavy-duty vehicle engine as an engine used in a motor vehicle having a gross vehicle weight rating greater than 14,000 pounds that is certified to the requirements of title 13, CCR sections 1956.1 or 1958.8.

Please provide comment as to whether (a) California's determination that its amendments as referenced in its March 7, 2005, request letter, are at least as protective of public health and welfare as applicable federal standards is arbitrary and capricious, (b) California needs separate standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions, and (c) California's standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are consistent with section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act.

Procedures for Public Participation

In recognition that public hearings are designed to give interested parties an opportunity to participate in this proceeding, there are no adverse parties as such. Statements by participants will not be subject to cross-examination by other participants without special approval by the presiding officer. The presiding officer is authorized to strike from the record statements that he or she deems irrelevant or repetitious and to impose reasonable time limits on the duration of the statement of any participant.

If hearing(s) are held, the Agency will make a verbatim record of the proceedings. Interested parties may arrange with the reporter at the hearing(s) to obtain a copy of the transcript at their own expense. Regardless of whether public hearing(s) are held, EPA will keep the record open until September 26, 2005. Upon expiration of the comment period, the Administrator will render a decision on CARB's request based on the record of the public hearing(s), if any, relevant written submissions, and other information that he deems pertinent. All information will be available for

inspection at EPA Air Docket. (OAR–2005–100). Persons with comments containing proprietary information must distinguish such information from other comments to the greatest possible extent and label it as “Confidential Business Information” (CBI). If a person making comments wants EPA to base its decision in part on a submission labeled CBI, then a nonconfidential version of the document that summarizes the key data or information should be submitted for the public docket. To ensure that proprietary information is not inadvertently placed in the docket, submissions containing such information should be sent directly to the contact person listed above and not to the public docket. Information covered by a claim of confidentiality will be disclosed by EPA only to the extent allowed and by the procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. If no claim of confidentiality accompanies the submission when EPA receives it, EPA will make it available to the public without further notice to the person making comments.

Dated: July 12, 2005.

Jeffrey R. Holmstead,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 05–14069 Filed 7–15–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Request for Information Relating to Research Awards

AGENCY: Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) and Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Office of Federal Financial Management (OFFM).

ACTION: Request for information relating to the use of multiple Principal Investigators (PIs) on awards made under Federal research and research-related programs.

SUMMARY: Many areas of today’s research require multi-disciplinary teams in which the intellectual leadership of the project is shared among two or more individuals. To facilitate this team approach through recognition of the contributions of the team leadership members, OSTP issued a memorandum to all Federal research

agencies on January 4, 2005, requiring them to formally allow more than one PI on individual research awards. The Federal agencies are now seeking input from the research community—scientists, research administrators, and organizations that represent components of the scientific research community—on how best to implement this policy. The current Request for Information (RFI) poses a series of questions around core elements that may comprise each agency’s implementation plan. These elements include:

(1) Statement of what constitutes a PI; (2) designation of contact PI; (3) application instructions for listing more than one PI; (4) PIs at different institutions; (5) access to award and review information, and (6) access to public data systems.

DATES: Comments must be received by September 16, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Beth Phillips, Office of Federal Financial Management, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503; telephone 202–395–3993; FAX 202–395–3952; e-mail ephillip@omb.eop.gov. Due to potential delays in OMB’s receipt and processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, we encourage respondents to submit comments electronically to ensure timely receipt. We cannot guarantee that comments mailed will be received before the comment closing date. Please include “Multiple Principal Investigators” in the subject line of the e-mail message, and your name, title, organization, postal address, telephone number and e-mail address in the text of the e-mail message. Please also include the full body of your comments in the test of the e-mail message and as an attachment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information on the Research Business Models (RBM) Subcommittee see the RBM Web site at <http://rbm.nih.gov>, or contact Geoff Grant at the Office of Science and Technology Policy at 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503; e-mail ggrant@ostp.eop.gov; telephone 202–456–6131; FAX 202–456–6027.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on RBM

This proposal is an initiative of the Research Business Models (RBM) Subcommittee of the Committee on Science (CoS), a committee of the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC). The RBM Subcommittee’s objectives include:

- Facilitating a coordinated effort across Federal agencies to address

policy implications arising from the changing nature of scientific research, and

- Examining the effects of these changes on business models for the conduct of scientific research sponsored by the Federal government.

The Subcommittee used public comments, agency perspectives, and input from a series of regional public meetings to identify priority areas in which it would focus its initial efforts. In each priority area, the Subcommittee is pursuing initiatives to promote, as appropriate, either common policy, the streamlining of current procedures, or the identification of agencies’ and institutions’ “effective practices.” As information about the initiatives becomes available, it is posted at the Subcommittee’s Internet site <http://rbm.nih.gov>.

II. Background on the Plan To Recognize Multiple PIs on Federal Research Projects

Many areas of research, in particular, translations of complex discoveries into useful applications, increasingly require multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary teams. Innovation and progress still spring from and depend on creative individual investigators, but collaborative synergy plays an increasingly important role in advancing science and engineering. In deciding whether to do research as members of multi-disciplinary teams, individual investigators must consider how credit for their participation would be judged by the current incentive and reward policies of their academic institutions, by their funding agencies, and by colleagues within their own disciplines. The present system takes its structure from the paradigm of the single “Principal Investigator”. Although this model has worked well and encourages individual creativity and productivity, it also can discourage team efforts.

Multi-disciplinary research teams can be organized in a variety of ways. Research teams vary in terms of size, hierarchy, location of participants, goals, and structure. Depending on the size and the goals, the management structure of a team may include: a director and/or multiple directors, assistant or associate directors, managers, group leaders, team leaders, investigators, and others as needed. Regardless of how a research team is organized, a pertinent and important question is how to apportion credit fairly if multiple individuals provide the intellectual leadership and direction of the team effort.