

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.ID, 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. Add temporary § 100.35–T05–107 to read as follows:

#### § 100.35–T05–107 John H. Kerr Reservoir, Clarksville, Virginia.

(a) *Regulated area.* The regulated area is established for the waters of the John H. Kerr Reservoir, adjacent to the State Route 15 Highway Bridge and Occoneechee State Park, Clarksville, Virginia, from shoreline to shoreline, bounded on the south by a line running northeasterly from a point along the shoreline at latitude 36°37′14″ N, longitude 078°32′46.5″ W, thence to latitude 36°37′39.2″ N, longitude 078°32′08.8″ W, and bounded on the

north by the State Route 15 Highway Bridge. 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 Clarksville Hydroplane 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: (i) Stop the vessel immediately when directed to do so by any Official Patrol and then proceed only as directed.

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

(iii) 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 7:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on October 1 and 2, 2005.

Dated: August 22, 2005.

S.H. Ratti,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 05–17428 Filed 8–31–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–U

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 100

[CGD05–05–104]

RIN 1625–AA08

#### Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Spa Creek, Annapolis, MD

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish permanent special local

regulations for the “Tug-of-War”, a marine event conducted over the waters of Spa Creek between Eastport and Annapolis, Maryland. 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 portions of Spa Creek during the event.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 3, 2005.

**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 are part of docket CGD05–05–104, 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, Auxiliary and Recreational Boating Safety 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 CGD05–05–104, 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. You may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the address 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

Annually, the City of Annapolis sponsors the "Tug-of-War", across the waters of Spa Creek between Eastport and Annapolis, Maryland. The event consists of a tug of war between teams on the Eastport side of Spa Creek pulling against teams on the Annapolis side of Spa Creek. The opposing teams will pull a floating rope approximately 1700 feet in length, spanning Spa Creek. A fleet of spectator vessels is anticipated. Due to the need for vessel control while the rope is spanned across Spa Creek, 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 this permanent rule on specified waters of Spa Creek. The regulated area would include a 400 foot buffer on either side of the rope that spans Spa Creek from shoreline to shoreline. This rule would be enforced annually from 10:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. on the first Saturday in November and would restrict general navigation in the regulated area during the event. Except for participants and vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel could enter or remain in the regulated area. The Coast Guard Patrol Commander could stop the event to allow vessels to transit the regulated area. For 2005 only, the enforcement period of the regulation would be changed from the first Saturday in November to the last Saturday in October.

### 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 permanent rule prevents traffic from transiting a portion of Spa Creek during the event,

the effect of this regulation will not be significant due to the limited duration that the regulated area will be in effect and the extensive advance notifications that will be made to the maritime community via marine information broadcasts, local radio stations and area newspapers so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly. Additionally, the proposed regulated area has been narrowly tailored to impose the least impact on general navigation yet provide the level of safety deemed necessary. Vessel traffic will be able to transit the regulated area when the Coast Guard Patrol Commander deems it is safe to do so.

### 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 rule will effect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of Spa Creek during the event.

This proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. This rule will be in effect for only a 4-hour period. Vessel traffic will be able to transit the regulated area when the Coast Guard Patrol Commander deems it is safe to do so. Before the enforcement period, we will 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 proposed 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 Dennis Sens, Project Manager, Auxiliary and Recreational Boating Safety Branch, at (757) 398–6204. 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.

### 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.ID, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and

have made a preliminary determination 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, we believe that this rule should be categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h), of the Instruction, an "Environmental Analysis Check List" is 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. Add § 100.534 to read as follows:

#### § 100.534 Tug-of-War; Spa Creek, Annapolis, Maryland.

(a) *Regulated area.* A regulated area is established for the waters of Spa Creek from shoreline to shoreline, extending 400 feet from either side of a rope spanning Spa Creek from a position at latitude 38°58'36.9"N, longitude 076°29'03.8"W on the Annapolis shoreline to a position at latitude 38°58'26.4"N, longitude 076°28'53.7"W on the Eastport shoreline. 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 Baltimore.

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

(3) *Participant* means all vessels participating in the "Tug of War" under the auspices of the Marine Event Permit issued to the event sponsor and approved by Commander, Coast Guard Sector Baltimore.

(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:

(i) Stop the vessel immediately when directed to do so by any official patrol.

(ii) Proceed as directed by any official patrol.

(iii) Unless otherwise directed by the official patrol, operate at a minimum wake speed not to exceed six (6) knots.

(d) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced annually from 10:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. on the first Saturday in November. In 2005 the section will be enforced on the last Saturday in October instead of the first Saturday in November.

Dated: August 18, 2005.

**L.L. Hereth,**

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

[FR Doc. 05–17427 Filed 8–31–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

#### Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

#### 42 CFR Parts 405, 410, 411, 413, 414, and 426

[CMS–1502–CN]

**RIN 0938–AN84**

#### Medicare Program; Revisions to Payment Policies Under the Physician Fee Schedule for Calendar Year 2006; Corrections

**AGENCY:** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), HHS.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects errors in the proposed rule that appeared in the **Federal Register** on August 8, 2005 entitled "Medicare Program; Revisions to Payment Policies Under the Physician Fee Schedule for Calendar Year 2006."

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Diane Milstead, (410) 786–3355.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

FR Doc. 05–15370, of August 8, 2005, contains the proposed rule to update the physician fee schedule for CY 2006 (70 FR 45764). We identified several errors and are correcting them in the "Correction of Errors" section below.