

request comment on how to apply the criteria they must consider when developing the accuracy and integrity guidelines (*see* section 623(e)(3) of the FCRA) so as not to create unnecessary or unduly burdensome requirements. Also, the Federal banking agencies and NCUA request comment on how to weigh the considerations relating to when furnishers must reinvestigate disputes raised directly by consumers (*see* section 623(a)(8)(B) of the FCRA) so as not to create unnecessary or unduly burdensome requirements for furnishers.

Executive Order 12866

OCC and OTS: The OCC and OTS do not know whether the guidelines and regulations they will propose will constitute a significant regulatory action under the Executive Order 12866. Executive Order 12866 requires preparation of an analysis for agency actions that are “significant regulatory actions.” “Significant regulatory actions” are actions that may result in regulations that are likely to:

- Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities;
- Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;
- Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or
- Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.¹²

This ANPR neither establishes nor proposes any regulatory requirements. Because this ANPR does not contain a specific proposal, information is not available with which to prepare a regulatory analysis. The OCC and OTS will each prepare a regulatory analysis if they proceed with a proposed rule that constitutes a significant regulatory action.

Accordingly, the OCC and OTS solicit comment, information, and data on the

potential effects on the economy of any guidelines and regulations that commenters may recommend. The OCC and OTS encourage commenters to provide information about estimates of costs, benefits, other effects, or any other information, particularly costs to implement the statutory requirements if institutions are already meeting any of those requirements (*e.g.*, documenting policies and procedures, monitoring, and training). In addition, the OCC and OTS ask commenters to identify or estimate start-up or non-recurring costs separately from costs or effects they believe would be ongoing. Also, the OCC and OTS ask commenters to provide data on the total number of consumer disputes reported annually and the per-unit cost to resolve each dispute. Quantitative information would be the most useful. The OCC and OTS will carefully consider the costs and benefits associated with this regulatory action.

Dated: March 15, 2006.

John C. Dugan,

Comptroller of the Currency.

By order of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 13, 2006.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Secretary of the Board.

By order of the Board of Directors.

Dated at Washington, DC, the 10th day of February, 2006. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Robert E. Feldman,

Executive Secretary.

Dated: February 6, 2006.

By the Office of Thrift Supervision.

John M. Reich,

Director.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board on March 13, 2006.

Mary Rupp,

Secretary of the Board.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 06–2758 Filed 3–21–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–33–P; 6210–01–P; 6714–10–P; 6720–01–P; 7535–01–P; 6750–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2006–23645; Directorate Identifier 2006–CE–04–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Heavy Industries MU–2B Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Mitsubishi Heavy Industries (MHI) MU–2B series airplanes. This proposed AD would require you to incorporate text from the service information into the Limitations Section of the FAA-approved Airplane Flight Manual (AFM). This proposed AD results from a recent safety evaluation that used a data-driven approach to analyze the design, operation, and maintenance of the MU–2B series airplanes in order to determine their safety and define what steps, if any, are necessary for their safe operation. Part of that evaluation was the identification of unsafe conditions that exist or could develop on the affected type design airplanes. We are issuing this proposed AD to detect and correct improper rigging of the propeller feathering linkage. The above issue, if uncorrected, could result in degraded performance and poor handling qualities with consequent loss of control of the airplane.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by May 2, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following addresses to comment on this proposed AD:

- DOT Docket Web site: Go to <http://dms.dot.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- Government-wide rulemaking Web site: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

- Fax: 1–202–493–2251.
- Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington,

¹² Executive Order 12866 (September 30, 1993), 58 FR 51735 (October 4, 1993), as amended by Executive Order 13258 (February 26, 2002), 67 FR 9385 (February 28, 2002). A “regulatory action” is “any substantive action by an agency (normally published in the **Federal Register**) that promulgates or is expected to lead to the promulgation of a final rule or regulation, including notices of inquiry, advance notices of proposed rulemaking, and notices of proposed rulemaking.” Executive Order 12866, section 3(e).

DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Contact Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., 4951 Airport Parkway, Suite 800, Addison, Texas 75001; telephone: 972-934-5480; facsimile: 972-934-5488 for the service information identified in this proposed AD.

You may examine the comments on this proposed AD in the AD docket on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rao Edupuganti, Aerospace Engineer, ASW-150, Fort Worth Aircraft Certification Office, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, Texas 76193; telephone (817) 222-5284; fax (817) 222-5960.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments regarding this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under **ADDRESSES**. Include the docket number, "FAA-2006-23645; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-04-AD" at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend the proposed AD in light of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://dms.dot.gov>, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact with FAA personnel concerning this proposed rulemaking. Using the search function of the DOT docket Web site, anyone can find and read the comments received into any of our dockets, including the name of the individual who sent the comment (or signed the comment on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review the DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477-78) or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Discussion

Recent accidents and the service history of the Mitsubishi MU-2B series airplanes prompted FAA to conduct an MU-2B Safety Evaluation. This evaluation used a data-driven approach to analyze the design, operation, and

maintenance of the MU-2B series airplanes in order to determine their safety and define what steps, if any, are necessary for their safe operation.

The safety evaluation provided an in-depth review and analysis of MU-2B accidents, incidents, safety data, pilot training requirements, engine reliability, and commercial operations. In conducting this evaluation, the team employed new analysis tools that provided a much more detailed root cause analysis of the MU-2B problems than was previously possible.

Part of that evaluation was the identification of unsafe conditions that exist or could develop on the affected type design airplanes. Field reports indicate an unsafe condition of improper rigging and/or adjustment of the propeller feathering linkage. Service centers found the unsafe condition during inspections. Incorrect adjustment of the feathering linkage could result in the linkage not pulling the feather valve far enough for the feathering system to function as designed. In the event of a negative torque sensing (NTS) failure, coupled with incorrect adjustment of the feathering linkage, an inability to feather the propeller could result in asymmetric drag and control difficulties that are outside of the operational envelope of the aircraft.

This condition, if not corrected, could result in degraded performance and poor handling qualities with consequent loss of control of the airplane.

Relevant Service Information

We have reviewed the following Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. service information:

- Service Bulletin No. 229, dated February 20, 1996; and
- Service Bulletin No. 090/76-003, dated January 22, 1997.

The service information describes procedures for inspecting the feather valve and linkage function.

Foreign Airworthiness Authority Information

The MU-2B series airplane was initially certificated in 1965 and again in 1976 under two separate type certificates that consist of basically the same type design. Japan is the State of Design for TC No. A2PC, and the United States is the State of Design for TC No. A10SW. The affected models are as follows (where models are duplicated,

specific serial numbers are specified in the individual TCs):

Type certificate	Affected models
A10SW	MU-2B-25, MU-2B-26, MU-2B-26A, MU-2B-35, MU-2B-36, MU-2B-36A, MU-2B-40, and MU-2B-60.
A2PC	MU-2B, MU-2B-10, MU-2B-15, MU-2B-20, MU-2B-25, MU-2B-26, MU-2B-30, MU-2B-35, and MU-2B-36.

The Japan Civil Aviation Bureau, the airworthiness authority for Japan, issued Japanese AD No. TCD 4379-96, dated February 20, 1996, to ensure the continued airworthiness of the airplanes in Japan.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of the Proposed AD

We are proposing this AD to address an unsafe condition that we determined is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design. The proposed AD would require you to incorporate information from the service bulletins into the Limitations Section of the FAA-approved AFM.

The Agency is committed to updating the aviation community of expected costs associated with the MU-2B series airplane safety evaluation conducted in 2005. As a result of that commitment, the accumulating expected costs of all ADs related to the MU-2B series airplane safety evaluation may be found in the Final Report section at the following Web site: http://www.faa.gov/aircraft/air_cert/design_approvals/small_airplanes/cos/mu2_foia_reading_library/.

Differences Between the Proposed AD and Service Information

The compliance time in the proposed AD is different from the compliance times in the service information, and the proposed AD requires the insertion of text into the Limitations Section of the AFM. The requirements of the proposed AD, if adopted as a final rule, would take precedence over the provisions in the service information.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this proposed AD affects 397 airplanes in the U.S. registry.

We estimate the following costs to accomplish the proposed inspection:

Labor cost	Parts cost	Total cost per airplane	Total cost on U.S. operators
1 work hour × \$80 = \$80	Not applicable	\$80	\$31,760

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA’s authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, Section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII, Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency’s authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701, “General requirements.” Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We have determined that this proposed AD would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This proposed AD would not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that the proposed regulation:

1. Is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866;
2. Is not a “significant rule” under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and
3. Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation of the estimated costs to comply with this proposed AD. See the **ADDRESSES** section for a location to examine the regulatory evaluation.

Examining the Dockets

You may examine the docket that contains the proposal, any comments received and any final disposition on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>, or in person at the DOT Docket Offices between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Docket Office (telephone 1–800–647–5227) is located on the plaza level of the Department of Transportation NASSIF Building at the street address stated in **ADDRESSES**. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after the Docket Management Facility receives them.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Mitsubishi Heavy Industries: Docket No. FAA–2006–23645; Directorate Identifier 2006–CE–04–AD.

Comments Due Date

(a) The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) must receive comments on this proposed airworthiness directive (AD) action by May 2, 2006.

Affected ADs

(b) None.

Applicability

(c) This AD affects the following airplane models and serial numbers that are certificated in any category:

Type certificate	Models	Serial Nos.
(1) A2PC	MU–2B, MU–2B–10, MU–2B–15, MU–2B–20, MU–2B–25, and MU–2B–26.	008 through 312, 314 through 320, and 322 through 347.
(2) A2PC	MU–2B–30, MU–2B–35, and MU–2B–36	501 through 651, 653 through 660, and 662 through 696.
(3) A10SW	MU–2B–25, MU–2B–26, MU–2B–26A, and MU–2B–40	313SA, 321SA, and 348SA through 459SA.
(4) A10SW	MU–2B–35, MU–2B–36, MU–2B–36A, and MU–2B–60	652SA, 661SA, and 697SA through 1569SA.

Unsafe Condition

(d) This AD results from a recent safety evaluation that used a data-driven approach to analyze the design, operation, and maintenance of the MU–2B series airplanes in order to determine their safety and define what steps, if any, are necessary for their safe

operation. Part of that evaluation was the identification of unsafe conditions that exist or could develop on the affected type design airplanes. The actions specified in this AD are intended to detect and correct improper rigging of the propeller feathering linkage. The above issue if uncorrected could result

in degraded performance and poor handling qualities with consequent loss of control of the airplane.

Compliance

(e) To address this problem, you must do the following:

Actions	Compliance	Procedures
Incorporate the following information into the Limitations Section of the FAA-approved Airplane Flight Manual (AFM): (1) For airplanes listed in Type Certificate No. A2PC insert pages 3 and 4 from Mitsubishi Heavy Industries (MHI) MU–2 Service Bulletin No. 229, dated February 20, 1996. (2) For airplanes listed in Type Certificate No. A10SW insert page 3 of 3 from MHI MU–2 Service Bulletin No. 090/76–003, dated January 22, 1997.	Within 100 hours time-in-service after the effective date of this AD.	The owner/operator holding at least a private pilot certificate as authorized by section 43.7 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7) may insert the information into the AFM as specified in paragraph (e) of this AD. Make an entry into the aircraft records showing compliance with this portion of the AD in accordance with section 43.9 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.9).

Note: The language in the service information states the procedure as an "inspection," but the procedure is a "pilot check."

Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

(f) The Manager, Fort Worth Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, has the authority to approve alternative methods of compliance for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

(g) For information on any already approved alternative methods of compliance or for information pertaining to this AD, contact Rao Edupuganti, Aerospace Engineer, ASW-150, Fort Worth ACO, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, Texas 76193; telephone (817) 222-5284; fax (817) 222-5960.

Related Information

(h) Japan Civil Aviation Bureau Airworthiness Directives No. TCD 4379-96, dated February 20, 1996; and MHI Service Bulletins No. 229, dated February 20, 1996; and No. 090/76-003, dated January 22, 1997, also address the subject of this AD.

(i) To get copies of the documents referenced in this AD, contact Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., 4951 Airport Parkway, Suite 800, Addison, Texas 75001; telephone: 972-934-5480; facsimile: 972-934-5488. To view the AD docket, go to the Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL-401, Washington, DC, or on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>. The docket number is Docket No. FAA-2006-23645; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-04-AD.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on March 16, 2006.

James E. Jackson,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E6-4123 Filed 3-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Secretary

31 CFR Part 10

[REG-122380-02]

RIN 1545-BA72

Regulations Governing Practice Before the Internal Revenue; Correction

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Treasury.

ACTION: Correction to notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing.

SUMMARY: This document contains corrections to a notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing that was published in the **Federal Register** on Wednesday, February 8, 2006 (71 FR 6421). These proposed

regulations affect individuals who practice before the Internal Revenue Service (Circular 230). The proposed amendments modify the general standards of practice before the Internal Revenue Service.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brinton T. Warren at (202) 622-7800 (not toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing (REG-122380-02) that are the subject of these corrections are under 31 CFR sections 10.1, 10.2, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7, 10.22, 10.25, 10.27, 10.29, 10.34, 10.35, 10.50, 10.51, 10.52, 10.60, 10.61, 10.62, 10.63, 10.65, 10.68, 10.70, 10.71, 10.72, 10.73, 10.76, 10.77, 10.78, 10.82, 10.90 and 10.91.

Need for Correction

As published, the notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing (REG-122380-02) contains errors that may prove to be misleading and are in need of clarification.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking (REG-122380-02), that was the subject of FR Doc. 06-1106, is corrected as follows:

1. On page 6421, column 3, the regulation heading, line 5, (RIN 1545-AY05) is corrected to read "RIN 1545-BA72".
2. On page 6421, column 3, under the paragraph heading "DATES", line 3, the language, "by April 10, 2006. Outlines of topics to" is corrected to read "by April 28, 2006. Outlines of topics to".
3. On page 6421, column 3, under the paragraph heading "DATES", the last line, the language, "received by April 10, 2006." is corrected to read "received by May 31, 2006."
4. On page 6426, column 2, in the preamble under the paragraph heading "Comments and Public Hearing", third paragraph, line 5, the language, "comments by April 10, 2006 and an" is corrected to read "comments by April 28, 2006 and an".
5. On page 6426, column 2, in the preamble under the paragraph heading "Comments and Public Hearing", third paragraph the last line, the language, "April 10, 2006. A period of 10 minutes" is corrected to read "May 31, 2006. A period of 10 minutes".

Richard S. Carro,

Senior Advisor to the General Counsel.

[FR Doc. E6-4105 Filed 3-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[CGD05-06-015]

RIN 1625-AA08

Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Onslow Bay, Beaufort Inlet, Morehead City State Port, Beaufort Harbor and Taylor Creek, NC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish special local regulations during the "Pepsi Americas' Sail 2006", tall ships parade and race to be held on Onslow Bay, Beaufort Inlet, inland waters of the Morehead City State Port and Beaufort Waterfront. This special local regulation is necessary to provide for the safety of life on navigable waters during the event. This proposed action is intended to restrict vessel traffic in segments of coastal North Carolina in the vicinity of Onslow Bay, Beaufort Inlet, inland waters of Morehead City State Port and Beaufort Harbor during the parade of sail and tall ship race.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before April 21, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (oax), Fifth Coast Guard District, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704-5004, hand-deliver them to Room 119 at the same address between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, or fax them to (757) 398-6203. The Auxiliary and Recreational Boating Safety 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: CWO C.D. Humphrey, U.S. Coast Guard Sector North Carolina, at (252) 247-4525.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you