

section 2.) may focus solely on advanced network development and testing such as a measurement and analysis infrastructure to accurately measure, calibrate, diagnose performance related problems, and predict the end-to-end performance of operational high-speed networks. The scope of a single project is expected to range from \$150K to \$500K.

Preapplications

Potential applicants are strongly encouraged to submit a brief preapplication that consists of two to three pages of narrative describing the research objectives and technical approach(s). Preapplications will be reviewed relative to the scope and research needs of the ASCR National Collaboratories and High Performance Networks Programs, as outlined in the summary paragraph and in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**. The preapplication should identify, on the cover sheet, the title of the project, the institution, principal investigator name, telephone, fax, and e-mail address. The focus element (Middleware Technology, Collaboratory Pilots, or High Performance Network Engineering) for the preapplication should also be clearly identified. A response to each preapplication discussing the potential programmatic relevance of a formal application will be communicated to the Principal Investigator within 7 to 14 days of receipt.

Collaboration

Applicants are encouraged to collaborate with researchers in other institutions, such as: universities, industry, non-profit organizations, federal laboratories and Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs), including the DOE National Laboratories, where appropriate, and to include cost sharing wherever feasible. Additional information on collaboration is available in the Application Guide for the Office of Science Financial Assistance Program that is available via the Internet at: <http://www.sc.doe.gov/production/grants/Colab.html>.

Program Funding

It is anticipated that up to \$6 million will be available for all National Collaboratories and High Performance Networks Programs awards in Fiscal Year 2001; from ten to as many as fifteen awards are anticipated, contingent on availability of appropriated funds in FY 2001 and the size of the awards. Multiple year funding is expected, also contingent on

availability of funds and progress of the research.

Awards are expected to be at most \$500,000 per year for individual middleware technology and network engineering R&D projects. Awards for collaboratory pilots are expected to be at most \$2.5 million per year. Since pilots are expected to be multi-institution projects, awards under this notice would range from \$200,000 to \$600,000 for participation in a pilot. The term for projects can be from one to three years.

Merit Review

Applications will be subjected to scientific merit review (peer review) and will be evaluated against the following evaluation criteria, which are listed in descending order of importance 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 under item 1, Scientific and/or Technical Merit of the Project, will also consider the following elements:

- (a) The potential of the proposed project to make a significant impact in the effectiveness of SciDAC applications researchers.
- (b) The degree to which an application area can benefit from collaborative technology.
- (c) The extent to which the project will test important collaborative technologies.
- (d) The extent to which the results of the project are extensible to other program or discipline areas.

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

- (a) The degree to which the project adheres to the management philosophy of incorporating collaboration into the project execution.
- (b) The quality of the plan for ensuring interoperability and integration with software produced by other SciDAC efforts.
- (c) The extent to which the project incorporates broad community (industry/academia/other federal programs) interaction.

(d) Quality and clarity of proposed work schedule and deliverables.

(e) Knowledge of and coupling to previous efforts for collaborative technologies such as DOE 2000.

The evaluation will include program policy factors such as the relevance of the proposed research to the terms of the announcement and the agency's programmatic needs. Note, external peer reviewers are selected with regard to both their scientific expertise and the absence of conflict-of-interest issues. Non-federal reviewers will often be used, and submission of an application constitutes agreement that this is acceptable to the investigator(s) and the submitting institution.

Submission Information

The Project Description must be 20 pages or less, exclusive of attachments. It must contain an abstract or project summary on a separate page with the name of the applicant, mailing address, phone, FAX and E-mail listed. The application must include letters of intent from collaborators (briefly describing the intended contribution of each to the research), and short curriculum vitae for the applicant and any co-PIs.

To provide a consistent format for the submission, review and solicitation of grant applications submitted under this notice, the preparation and submission of grant applications must follow the guidelines given in the Application Guide for the Office of Science Financial Assistance Program, 10 CFR Part 605. Access to SC's Financial Assistance Application Guide is possible via the World Wide Web at: <http://www.science.doe.gov/production/grants/grants.html>.

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: December 7, 2000.

John Rodney Clark,

Associate Director of Science for Resource Management.

[FR Doc. 00-32251 Filed 12-18-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP01-45-000]

Colorado Interstate Gas Company; Notice of Application

December 13, 2000.

On December 4, 2000, Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG), P.O. Box 1087, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80944, filed in Docket No. CP01-45-000 an application pursuant to Section 7 of

the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and the Commission's Rules and Regulations for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing CIG to construct, own, operate, and maintain facilities in order to provide new transportation capacity to transport fuel for electric generation and for local gas distribution system supply, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. The filing may be viewed at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call 202-208-2222 for assistance).

Specifically, Tuscarora proposes to construct and operate:

- Approximately 35.1 miles of 24-inch diameter pipeline and appurtenant facilities which will begin at CIG's existing Ault Meter Station in Section 4, Township 7 North, Range 66 West, Weld County, Colorado and extend southward and parallel with CIG's existing pipeline, terminating at the Fort Lupton Compressor Station in Section 34, Township 2 North, Range 66 West, Weld County, Colorado.

- Two new 2,225 horsepower (ISO rated) natural gas fired reciprocating compressor units and appurtenant facilities at the Fort Lupton Compressor Station in Section 34, Township 2 North, Range 66 West, Weld County, Colorado.

- Approximately 84 miles of 20-inch diameter pipeline and appurtenant facilities which will begin at the Watkins Station in Section 31 township 3 South, Range 65 West, Weld County, Colorado and extend southward and parallel with CIG's existing Valley Line to CIG's Nixon Lateral in Section 25, Township 16 South, Range 65 West, El Paso County Colorado.

CIG estimates that the proposed facilities will cost \$72,138,900 and CIG proposes to roll-in these costs into its existing rates. CIG has entered into firm contracts and precedent agreements for 282,000 dth per day of capacity to be created by the proposed expansion.

Questions regarding the details of this proposed project should be directed to James R. West, Manager, Certificates, Colorado Interstate Gas Company, P.O. Box 1087, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80944, call (719) 520-4613.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this project. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceedings for this project should, on or before January 3, 2001, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.10). A person obtaining party status will be placed on the service list maintained by

the Secretary of the Commission and will receive copies of all documents filed by the applicant and by all other parties. A party must submit 14 copies of filings made with the Commission and must mail a copy to the applicant and to every other party in the proceeding. Only parties to the proceeding can ask for court review of Commission orders in the proceeding.

However, a person does not have to intervene in order to have comments considered. The second way to participate is by filing with the Secretary of the Commission, as soon as possible, an original and two copies of comments in support of or in opposition to this project. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment alone will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition to the project provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commenters will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commenters will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commenters will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

The Commission may issue a preliminary determination on non-environmental issues prior to the completion of its review of the environmental aspects of the project. This preliminary determination typically considers such issues as the need for the project and its economic effect on existing customers of the applicant, on other pipelines in the area, and on landowners and communities. For example, the Commission considers the extent to which the applicant may need to exercise eminent domain to obtain rights-of-way for the proposed project and balances that against the non-environmental benefits to be provided by the project. Therefore, if a

person has comments on community and landowner impacts from this proposal, it is important either to file comments or to intervene as early in the process as possible.

Comments and protests may be filed electronically via the internet in lieu of paper. See, 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's web site at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/efi/doorbell.htm>.

If the Commission decides to set the application for a formal hearing before an Administrative Law Judge, the commission will issue another notice describing that process. At the end of the Commission's review process, a final Commission order approving or denying a certificate will be issued.

David P. Boergers,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-32265 Filed 12-18-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP96-389-016]

Columbia Gulf Transmission Company; Notice of Negotiated Rate Filing

December 13, 2000.

Take notice that on December 6, 2000, Columbia Gulf Transmission Company (Columbia Gulf) tendered for filing the following Agreement to a recently filed negotiated rate transaction:

ITS-2 Service Agreement No. 70083 between Columbia Gulf Transmission Company and Exxon Mobil Corporation dated November 30, 2000

Transportation service which was scheduled to commence December 2, 2000.

Columbia Gulf states that copies of the filing have been served on all parties on the official service list created by the Secretary in the proceeding.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with sections 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission is determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party