

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory Commission****18 CFR Parts 35 and 37**

[Docket Nos. RM05–25–000 and RM05–17–000]

**Preventing Undue Discrimination and Preference in Transmission Service****AGENCY:** Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.**ACTION:** Correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects a paragraph formatting and numbering error in a notice of proposed rulemaking that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission published in the **Federal Register** on June 6, 2006. That action proposed amendments to Commission Order Nos. 888 and 889.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* June 6, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David D. Withnell, Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission at (202) 502–8421.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In FR Document 06–4904, published on June 6, 2006 (71 FR 32636) make the following correction:

On page 32695, in column 3, paragraph nos. 395 and 396 should be merged into one paragraph and designated no. 395. Paragraph no. 397 becomes 396 and the subsequent paragraph numbers are corrected accordingly. (The corrected sequence runs from the renumbered paragraph no. 396 to the last paragraph in the preamble, which will be paragraph no. 499.)

**Magalie R. Salas,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E6–10146 Filed 6–28–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY****Internal Revenue Service****26 CFR Part 1**

[REG–111578–06]

RIN 1545–BF56

**Computer Software Under Section 199(c)(5)(B); Correction****AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.**ACTION:** Correction to notice of proposed rulemaking by cross-reference to temporary regulations.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects a notice of proposed rulemaking by cross-reference to temporary regulations (REG–111578–06) that was published in the **Federal Register** on Thursday, June 1, 2006 (71 FR 31128). The document contains temporary regulations concerning the application of section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides a deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities, to certain transactions involving computer software.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paul Handleman or Lauren Ross Taylor, (202) 622–3040 (not a toll-free number).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

The notice of proposed rulemaking by cross-reference to temporary regulations (REG–111578–06) that is the subject of this correction is under section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code.

**Need for Correction**

As published, REG–111578–06 contains an error that may prove to be misleading and is in need of clarification.

**Correction of Publication**

Accordingly, the notice of proposed rulemaking by cross-reference to temporary regulations (REG–111578–06), that was the subject of FR Doc. 06–4827, is corrected as follows:

On page 31129, column 1, in the signature block, the language “Mark E. Mathews,” is corrected to read “Mark E. Matthews, ”.

**Guy R. Traynor,**

*Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch,  
Legal Processing Division, Associate Chief  
Counsel (Procedure and Administration).*

[FR Doc. E6–10250 Filed 6–28–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 100**

[CGD05–06–064]

RIN 1625–AA08

**Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Atlantic Ocean, Ocean City, MD****AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish special local regulations during the “Ocean City Maryland

Offshore Challenge”, a power boat race to be held on the waters of the Atlantic Ocean adjacent to the shoreline at Ocean City, MD. These special local regulations are necessary to provide for the safety of life on navigable waters during the event. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic in the regulated area during the power boat race.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before July 31, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** You may mail comments and related material to Commander (dpi), Fifth Coast Guard District, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704–5004, hand-deliver them to Room 415 at the same address between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, or fax them to (757) 391–8149. The Inspections and Investigations Branch, Fifth Coast Guard District, maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the above address between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dennis Sens, Project Manager, Inspections and Investigations Branch, at (757) 398–6204.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Request for Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (CGD05–06–064), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

**Public Meeting**

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the address listed under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this

rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

### Background and Purpose

On September 10, 2006, the Offshore Performance Association, Inc. will conduct the "Ocean City Maryland Offshore Challenge", on the waters of the Atlantic Ocean along the shoreline near Ocean City, MD. The event will consist of approximately 40 V-hull and twin-hull inboard hydroplanes racing in heats counter-clockwise around an oval race course. A fleet of spectator vessels is anticipated to gather nearby to view the competition. Due to the need for vessel control during the event, vessel traffic would be temporarily restricted to provide for the safety of participants, spectators and transiting vessels.

### Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish temporary special local regulations on specified waters of the Atlantic Ocean adjacent to Ocean City, MD. The regulated area includes a section of the Atlantic Ocean approximately two miles long, and one half mile wide, the course is approximately 300 yards offshore and runs parallel with the Ocean City, Maryland shoreline. The southern boundary of the regulated area is adjacent to and due east of 5th Street and the northern boundary of the area is adjacent to and due east of 43rd Street at Ocean City, Maryland. The temporary special local regulations would be enforced from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on September 10, 2006, and would restrict general navigation in the regulated area during the power boat race. The Coast Guard, at its discretion, when practical would allow the passage of vessels when races are not taking place. Except for participants and vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel would be allowed to enter or remain in the regulated area during the enforcement period. These regulations are needed to control vessel traffic during the event to enhance the safety of participants, spectators and transiting vessels.

### Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not "significant" under the regulatory policies and procedures of the

Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary.

Although this proposed regulation would prevent traffic from transiting a small segment of the Atlantic Ocean near Ocean City, MD during the event, the effect of this regulation will not be significant due to the limited duration that the regulated area would be enforced. Extensive advance notifications would be made to the maritime community via Local Notice to Mariners, marine information broadcasts, area newspapers and local radio stations, so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly.

### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term "small entities" comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit this section of the Atlantic Ocean during the event.

This proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. This proposed rule would be in effect for only a limited period. Although the regulated area would apply to waters of the Atlantic Ocean near the Ocean City, Maryland shoreline, traffic would be allowed to pass through the regulated area with the permission of the Coast Guard patrol commander. In the case where the patrol commander authorizes passage through the regulated area during the event, vessels would be required to proceed at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe course that minimizes wake near the race course. Before the enforcement period, we would issue maritime advisories so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental

jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

### Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the address listed under **ADDRESSES**. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

### Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.).

### Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

### Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year.

Though this proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

#### Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

#### Protection of Children

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

#### Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

#### Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under that order because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

#### Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use

voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

#### Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.1D and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 5100.1, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of a categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, this rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Special local regulations issued in conjunction with a regatta or marine parade permit are specifically excluded from further analysis and documentation under that section.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h), of the Instruction, an "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a "Categorical Exclusion Determination" are not required for this rule. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether to categorically exclude this rule from further environmental review.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 100

Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 100 as follows:

#### PART 100—SAFETY OF LIFE ON NAVIGABLE WATERS

1. The authority citation for part 100 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1233; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. From 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on September 10, 2006, add a temporary § 100.35–T05–064 to read as follows:

#### § 100.35–T05–064 Atlantic Ocean, Ocean City, MD.

(a) *Regulated area.* The regulated area is established for the waters of the Atlantic Ocean bounded by a line drawn from a position along the shoreline near Ocean City, MD at latitude 38°22'01" N., longitude 075°03'56" W., thence easterly to latitude 38°21'50" N., longitude 075°03'28" W., thence southwesterly to latitude 38°20'10" N., longitude 075°04'08" W., thence westerly to a position near the shoreline at latitude 38°20'15" N., longitude 075°04'38" W., thence northerly along the shoreline to the point of origin. All coordinates reference Datum NAD 1983.

(b) *Definitions.* (1) *Coast Guard Patrol Commander* means a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the Coast Guard who has been designated by the Commander, Coast Guard Sector Hampton Roads.

(2) *Official Patrol* means any vessel assigned or approved by Commander, Coast Guard Sector Hampton Roads with a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer on board and displaying a Coast Guard ensign.

(3) *Participant* includes all vessels participating in the Ocean City, Maryland Offshore Challenge under the auspices of the Marine Event Permit issued to the event sponsor and approved by Commander, Coast Guard Sector Hampton Roads.

(c) *Special local regulations.* (1) Except for event participants and persons or vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area.

(2) The operator of any vessel in the regulated area must stop the vessel immediately when directed to do so by any Official Patrol and then proceed only as directed.

(3) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Official Patrol.

(4) When authorized to transit the regulated area, all vessels shall proceed at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe course that minimizes wake near the race course.

(d) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on September 10, 2006.

Dated: June 16, 2006.

**L.L. Hereth,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. E6–10251 Filed 6–28–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**