

841, at II-747 (1986) (Conf. Rep.), 1986-3 (vol. 4) C.B. 608 (stating that the conference agreement follows the House bill and the Senate amendment on this restriction).

To clarify the scope of the investment-type property definition consistent with Congressional intent reflected in the legislative history, the Proposed Regulations would provide an express exception to the definition of investment-type property for capital projects that further the public purposes for which the tax-exempt bonds were issued. For example, investment-type property does not include a courthouse financed with governmental bonds or an eligible exempt facility under section 142, such as a public road, financed with private activity bonds.

2. Applicability Dates and Reliance

The proposed amendments to the definition of investment-type property in the Proposed Regulations are proposed to apply to bonds sold on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of publication of a Treasury Decision adopting these rules as final regulations in the **Federal Register**. Issuers may apply the Proposed Regulations to bonds that are sold before the applicability date provided in a Treasury Decision adopting these rules as final regulations in the **Federal Register**.

Special Analyses

This regulation is not subject to review under section 6(b) of Executive Order 12866 pursuant to the Memorandum of Agreement (April 11, 2018) between the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget regarding review of tax regulations. Because these regulations do not impose a collection of information on small entities, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. chapter 6) does not apply. Pursuant to section 7805(f) of the Code, this notice of proposed rulemaking will be submitted to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration for comment on its impact on small entities.

Comments and Requests for Public Hearing

Before the Proposed Regulations are adopted as final regulations, consideration will be given to any comments that are submitted timely to the IRS as prescribed in this preamble under the **ADDRESSES** heading. The Treasury Department and the IRS request comments on all aspects of the proposed rules. All comments will be available at www.regulations.gov or

upon request. A public hearing will be scheduled if requested in writing by any person that timely submits written comments. If a public hearing is scheduled, notice of the date, time, and place for the hearing will be published in the **Federal Register**.

Drafting Information

The principal authors of these regulations are Spence Hanemann of the Office of Associate Chief Counsel (Financial Institutions and Products) and Vicky Tsilas, formerly of the Office of Associate Chief Counsel (Financial Institutions and Products). However, other personnel from the Treasury Department and the IRS participated in their development.

List of Subjects in 26 CFR Part 1

Income taxes, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Proposed Amendments to the Regulations

Accordingly, 26 CFR part 1 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 1—INCOME TAXES

■ **Paragraph 1.** The authority citation for part 1 continues to read in part as follows:

Authority: 26 U.S.C. 7805 * * *

■ **Par. 2.** Section 1.148-0(c) is amended by adding entries for §§ 1.148-1(e)(4) and 1.148-11(n) to read as follows:

§ 1.148-0 Scope and table of contents.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

§ 1.148-1 Definitions and elections.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

(4) Exception for certain capital projects.

* * * * *

§ 1.148-11 Effective/applicability dates.

* * * * *

(n) Investment-type property.

■ **Par. 3.** Section 1.148-1 is amended by:

■ 1. Revising the first sentence of paragraph (e)(1).

■ 2. Adding paragraph (e)(4).

The revision and addition read as follows:

§ 1.148-1 Definitions and elections.

* * * * *

(e) *Investment-type property*—(1) *In general.* Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph (e), investment-type property includes any property, other than property described in section 148(b)(2)(A), (B), (C), or (E), that is held

principally as a passive vehicle for the production of income. * * *

* * * * *

(4) *Exception for certain capital projects.* Investment-type property does not include real property or tangible personal property (for example, land, buildings, and equipment) that is used in furtherance of the public purposes for which the tax-exempt bonds are issued. For example, investment-type property does not include a courthouse financed with governmental bonds or an eligible exempt facility under section 142, such as a public road, financed with private activity bonds.

* * * * *

■ **Par. 4.** Section 1.148-11 is amended by adding paragraph (n) to read as follows:

§ 1.148-11 Effective/applicability dates.

* * * * *

(n) *Investment-type property.* Section 1.148-1(e)(1) and (4) apply to bonds sold on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of publication of a Treasury Decision adopting these rules as final regulations in the **Federal Register**.

Kirsten Wielobob,

Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2018-12565 Filed 6-11-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Part 15

[FAR Case 2017-006; Docket No. 2017-0006, Sequence No. 1]

RIN 9000-AN53

Federal Acquisition Regulation: Exception From Certified Cost or Pricing Data Requirements—Adequate Price Competition

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DoD), General Services Administration (GSA), and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: DoD, GSA, and NASA are proposing to amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) to provide guidance to DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard, consistent with a section of the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2017 that addresses the exception from certified cost or pricing data requirements when price is based on adequate price competition.

DATES: Interested parties should submit written comments to the Regulatory Secretariat at one of the addresses shown below on or before August 13, 2018 to be considered in the formation of the final rule.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in response to FAR Case 2017–006 by any of the following methods:

Regulations.gov: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Submit comments via the Federal eRulemaking portal by entering “FAR Case 2017–006” under the heading “Enter Keyword or ID” and selecting “Search”. Select the link “Submit a Comment” that corresponds with “FAR Case 2017–006”. Follow the instructions provided at the “Submit a Comment” screen. Please include your name, company name (if any), and “FAR Case 2017–006” on your attached document.

Mail: General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (MVCB), ATTN: Lois Mandell, 1800 F Street NW, 2nd Floor, Washington, DC 20405–0001.

Instructions: Please submit comments only and cite “FAR Case 2017–006” in all correspondence related to this case. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal and/or business confidential information provided.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Michael O. Jackson, Procurement Analyst, at 202–208–4949 for clarification of content. For information pertaining to status or publication schedules, contact the Regulatory Secretariat at 202–501–4755. Please cite FAR Case 2017–006.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

DoD, GSA, and NASA are proposing to provide a separate standard for “adequate price competition” in the FAR, applicable only to DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard, consistent with the requirements of section 822 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 (Pub. L. 114–328). Setting forth the separate standard for DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard in the FAR provides a top-level framework to facilitate consistent implementation of section 822 at the agency level by DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard. Section 822 modifies 10 U.S.C. 2306a, the Truth in Negotiations Act, which is applicable only to DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard. Section

822 limits the exception for price based on adequate price competition to circumstances in which there is adequate competition that results in at least two or more responsive and viable competing bids.

II. Discussion and Analysis

This proposed rule modifies the standard for adequate price competition at FAR 15.403–1(c)(1), to provide a separate standard for DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard. There are also conforming changes to the cross references at FAR 15.305(a)(1) and 15.404–1(b)(2)(i).

III. Applicability to Contracts at or Below the Simplified Acquisition Threshold and for Commercial Items, Including Commercially Available Off-the-Shelf Items

This rule does not contain any provision or clause that applies to contracts or subcontracts at or below the simplified acquisition threshold or contracts or subcontracts for the acquisition of commercial items, including commercially available off-the-shelf items.

IV. Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

Executive Orders (E.O.s) 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). E.O. 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This is not a significant regulatory action and, therefore, was not subject to review under Section 6(b) of E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, dated September 30, 1993. This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804.

V. Executive Order 13771

This proposed rule is not expected to be an E.O. 13771 regulatory action, because this proposed rule is not significant under E.O. 12866.

VI. Regulatory Flexibility Act

DoD, GSA, and NASA do not expect this rule to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.* However, an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) has been performed and is summarized as follows:

This rule proposes to provide a separate standard for “adequate price competition” in the FAR for DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard, consistent with the requirements of section 822 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 (Pub. L. 114–328).

The objective of this rule is to clarify that there is a different standard applicable to DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard, and to provide a top-level framework to facilitate consistent implementation of section 822 at the agency level by DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard. The statutory basis is 10 U.S.C. 2306a, as amended by section 822 of the NDAA for FY 2017.

This rule only provides a statement of internal guidance to DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard, *i.e.*, “For DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard, a price is based on adequate price competition only if two or more offerors, competing independently, submit responsive and viable offers.” This principle will not have impact on small entities until implemented at the agency level by DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard.

There are no projected reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance requirements of the rule. The rule amends the standards for adequate price competition for DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard. However, the corollary of this FAR change is that DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard will be required to obtain certified cost or pricing data from an offeror when only one offer is received and no other exception applies. The rule does not duplicate, overlap, or conflict with any other Federal rules.

Since this rule does not impose a burden on small entities, DoD, GSA, and NASA were unable to identify any alternatives that would reduce burden on small business and still meet the requirements of the statute.

The Regulatory Secretariat Division has submitted a copy of the IRFA to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration. A copy of the IRFA may be obtained from the Regulatory Secretariat Division. DoD, GSA, and NASA invite comments from small business concerns and other interested parties on the expected impact of this rule on small entities.

DoD, GSA, and NASA will also consider comments from small entities concerning the existing regulations in subparts affected by the rule consistent with 5 U.S.C. 610. Interested parties must submit such comments separately and should cite 5 U.S.C. 610 (FAR Case 2017–006), in correspondence.

VII. Paperwork Reduction Act

The rule does not contain any information collection requirements that require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Part 15

Government procurement.

Dated: June 6, 2018.

William F. Clark,

Director, Office of Government-wide Acquisition Policy, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy.

Therefore, DoD, GSA, and NASA proposes to amend 48 CFR part 15 as set forth below:

PART 15—CONTRACTING BY NEGOTIATION

- 1. The authority citation for 48 CFR part 15 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 40 U.S.C. 121(c); 10 U.S.C. chapter 137; and 51 U.S.C. 20113.

15.305 [Amended]

- 2. Amend section 15.305 by removing from paragraph (a)(1) in the fourth sentence “(see 15.403–1(c)(1)(i)(B))” and adding “(see 15.403–1(c)(1)(i)(A)(2))” in its place.

- 3. Amend section 15.403–1 by—

- a. Revising the heading of paragraph (c); and

- b. Revising paragraph (c)(1) to read as follows:

15.403–1 Prohibition on obtaining certified cost or pricing data (10 U.S.C. 2306a and 41 U.S.C. chapter 35).

* * * * *

(c) *Standards for exceptions from certified cost or pricing data requirements.*

(1) *Adequate price competition.* (i) For agencies other than DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard, a price is based on adequate price competition if—

(A) Two or more responsible offerors, competing independently, submit priced offers that satisfy the Government’s expressed requirement and if—

(1) Award will be made to the offeror whose proposal represents the best value (see 2.101) where price is a substantial factor in source selection; and

(2) There is no finding that the price of the otherwise successful offeror is unreasonable. Any finding that the price is unreasonable must be supported by a statement of the facts and approved at a level above the contracting officer;

(B) There was a reasonable expectation, based on market research or other assessment, that two or more responsible offerors, competing independently, would submit priced offers in response to the solicitation’s expressed requirement, even though only one offer is received from a responsible offeror and if—

(1) Based on the offer received, the contracting officer can reasonably conclude that the offer was submitted with the expectation of competition, e.g., circumstances indicate that—

(i) The offeror believed that at least one other offeror was capable of submitting a meaningful offer; and

(ii) The offeror had no reason to believe that other potential offerors did not intend to submit an offer; and

(2) The determination that the proposed price is based on adequate price competition and is reasonable has been approved at a level above the contracting officer; or

(C) Price analysis clearly demonstrates that the proposed price is reasonable in comparison with current or recent prices for the same or similar items, adjusted to reflect changes in market conditions, economic conditions, quantities, or terms and conditions under contracts that resulted from adequate price competition.

(ii) For DoD, NASA, and the Coast Guard, a price is based on adequate price competition only if two or more responsible offerors, competing independently, submit responsive and viable offers. (10 U.S.C. 2306a(b)(1)(A)(i)).

* * * * *

15.404–1 [Amended]

- 4. Amend section 15.404–1 by removing from paragraph (b)(2)(i) “(see 15.403–1(c)(1)(i))” and adding “(see 15.403–1(c)(1)(i) and (ii))” in its place.

[FR Doc. 2018–12539 Filed 6–11–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–EP–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 300

[Docket No. 180202124–8124–01]

RIN 0648–BH59

International Fisheries; Eastern Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Area of Overlap Between the Convention Areas of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS is considering whether to continue, or to revise, the management regime for fishing vessels that target tuna and other highly migratory fish species (HMS) in the area

of overlapping jurisdiction between the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) and the Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPFC) in the tropical Pacific Ocean. To that end, we are issuing this advance notice of proposed rulemaking to seek public input about whether U.S. fishing vessels fishing in that area should be governed by conservation measures adopted by IATTC or conservation measures adopted by WCPFC.

DATES: Comments on this advance notice of proposed rulemaking must be submitted in writing by July 12, 2018.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on this document, identified by NOAA–NMFS–2018–0049, by any of the following methods:

- **Electronic submission:** Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2018-0049, click the “Comment Now!” icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.

- **Mail:** Submit written comments to Michael D. Tosatto, Regional Administrator, NMFS, Pacific Islands Regional Office, 1845 Wasp Blvd., Building 176, Honolulu, HI 96818.

- **Fax:** (808) 725–5215; Attn: Michael D. Tosatto, Regional Administrator, NMFS, Pacific Islands Regional Office.

Instructions: Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, might not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on www.regulations.gov without change. All personal identifying information (e.g., name and address), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter “N/A” in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The United States is a member of both the IATTC and WCPFC. The convention areas for the IATTC and WCPFC overlap in the Pacific Ocean waters within a rectangular area bounded by 50° S latitude, 150° W longitude, 130° W longitude, and 4° S latitude (“overlap area”). Historically, regulations implementing the conservation measures adopted by the IATTC (see 50