

(2) Any other information the Secretary may require to evaluate the performance of a business incubator to ensure appropriate implementation of the IBIP.

(b) To the maximum extent practicable, IEED will not require an awardee to report the information listed in paragraph (a) of this section that the awardee provides to IEED under another program.

(c) IEED will coordinate with the heads of other Federal agencies to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, the report content and form under paragraph (a) of this section are consistent with other reporting requirements for Federal programs that provide business and entrepreneurial assistance.

Subpart F—IEED Grant Administration

§ 1187.50 How will IEED evaluate awardees' performance?

Not later than one year after the date on which IEED awards a grant to an eligible applicant under the IBIP, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, IEED will conduct an evaluation of, and prepare a report on, the awardee, which will:

(a) Describe the performance of the eligible applicant; and

(b) Be used in determining the ongoing eligibility of the eligible applicant.

§ 1187.51 Will IEED facilitate relationships between awardees and educational institutions serving Native American communities?

IEED will facilitate the relationships between awardees and educational institutions serving Native American communities, including Tribal colleges and universities.

§ 1187.52 How will IEED coordinate with other Federal agencies?

IEED will coordinate with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and Treasury, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that awardees have the information and materials they need to provide Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs with the information and assistance necessary to apply for business and entrepreneurial development programs administered by those agencies.

Bryan Newland,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2021-07175 Filed 4-12-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4337-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[Docket Number USCG-2021-0029]

RIN 1625-AA08

Special Local Regulations; Mystic Sharkfest Swim, Mystic River, Mystic, CT

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to issue special local regulations for an annual Mystic Sharkfest Swim event on the Mystic River. This proposed rule is intended to ensure the protection of the maritime public and event participants from the hazards associated with this marine event. When enforced, these special local regulations would restrict vessels from transiting the regulated area during this annually recurring events. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before May 13, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2021-0029 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. See the "Public Participation and Request for Comments" portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for further instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this proposed rulemaking, call or email Marine Science Technician 1st Class Chris Gibson, Waterways Management Division, Sector Long Island Sound; Tel: (203) 468-4565; Email: chris.a.gibson@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
COTP Captain of the Port
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
§ Section
U.S.C. United States Code

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

Many marine events are held on an annual recurring basis on the navigable waters within the Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port (COTP) Zone. The Coast Guard has

established special local regulations for some of these annually recurring events to ensure the protection of the maritime public and event participants from potential hazards.

Regulations establishing special local regulations to restrict vessel traffic are located in part 100 of Title 33 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Section 100.100 in part 100 establishes Special Local Regulations to ensure the safety and security of marine related events, participants, and spectators in Sector Long Island Sound's area of responsibility. The COTP Long Island Sound proposes to amend Table 1 of 33 CFR 100.100 Special Local Regulations; Regattas and Boat Races in the Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone because adding this single reoccurring event will considerably reduce administrative overhead and provide the public with notice through publication in the **Federal Register** of the upcoming recurring special local regulation.

The Secretary of Homeland Security has delegated to the Coast Guard authority under section 70041 of Title 46 of the U.S. Code (46 U.S.C. 70041) to issue these regulations.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish special local regulations for the annual Mystic Sharkfest Swim event by adding this event to Table 1 to 33 CFR 100.100. The event would occur on a day in July at a time to be determined each year. The regulated area would encompass all waters of the Mystic River in Mystic, CT from Mystic Seaport, down the Mystic River, under the Bascule Drawbridge, to the boat launch ramp at the north end of Seaport Marine. When enforced on the one day in July each year, these special local regulations would restrict vessels from transiting the regulated area. The specific proposed description of this proposed regulation appears at the end of this document.

IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive orders, and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. This NPRM has not been designated a

“significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, and duration and time-of-day of the special local regulation. Moreover, the Coast Guard would issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 about the special local regulation and the rule would allow vessels to seek permission to enter the area. Vessel traffic would also be able to request permission from the COTP or a designated representative to enter the restricted area.

B. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, as amended, requires Federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. 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.

While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit this proposed regulated area may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section IV.A above this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator.

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.

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. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please call or email the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

C. Collection of Information

This proposed rule would not call for a new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

D. Federalism and Indian Tribal Governments

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132 (Federalism), if it has 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. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in Executive Order 13132.

Also, 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. If you believe this proposed rule has implications for federalism or Indian tribes, please call or email the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

E. 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 (adjusted for inflation) 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.

F. Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Directive 023–01, Rev. 1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on

the human environment. This proposed rule involves adding an annually recurring marine event to the already listed Table in 33 CFR 100.100. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L61 of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to call or email the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places, or vessels.

V. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking, and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <https://www.regulations.gov>, call or email the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. Comments we post to <https://www.regulations.gov> will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and submissions in response to this document, see DHS’s eRulemaking System of Records notice (85 FR 14226, March 11, 2020).

Public comments will be in our online docket at <https://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that website’s instructions. We review all comments received, but we will only post comments that address the topic of the proposed rule. We may choose not to post off-topic, inappropriate, or duplicate comments that we receive. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.

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 is proposing 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: 46 U.S.C. 70041; 33 CFR 1.05–1.

■ 2. Amend Table 1 in § 100.100 by adding item 7.8 in numerical order to read as follows:

§ 100.100 Special Local Regulations; Regattas and Boat Races in the Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone.

* * * * *

TABLE 1 TO § 100.100

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------|--|---|---|---|---|
| * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 7 | July | | | | | |
| * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 7.8 Mystic Sharkfest Swim | | • Date: A single day during July. | | | | |
| | | • Time: To be determined annually. | | | | |
| | | • Location: All waters of the Mystic River in Mystic, CT from Mystic Seaport, down the Mystic River, under the Bascule Drawbridge at 41°21'17.046" N, 071°58'8.742" W, to finish at the boat launch ramp at the north end of Seaport Marine. | | | | |
| * | * | * | * | * | * | * |

Dated: April 8, 2021
E.J. Van Camp,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Long Island Sound.
 [FR Doc. 2021–07650 Filed 4–12–21; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2021–0062]

RIN 1625–AA87

Security Zone: Electric Boat Shipyard, Groton, CT

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to modify the security zone boundaries surrounding the Electric Boat Shipyard in Groton, Connecticut. The proposed amendment to the Security Zone is due to the expanding operations at Electric Boat Shipyard. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before May 13, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2021–0062 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>.

www.regulations.gov. See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for further instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this proposed rulemaking, call or email Marine Science Technician 3rd Class Ashley Dodd, Waterways Management Division, Sector Long Island Sound; Tel: (203) 468–4469; Email: Ashley.M.Dodd@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
 COTP Captain of the Port
 DHS Department of Homeland Security
 FR Federal Register
 NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
 § Section
 U.S.C. United States Code

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

Electric Boat Shipyard has a history of constructing vessels for the United States Navy. For this reason a security zone is established to safeguard from destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other submersive acts, or other causes of a similar nature to its waterfront facility and its vessels that they construct. In order for Electric Boat Shipyard to assemble and launch the Columbia Class Submarine for the U.S. Navy they are building a new submarine

construction facility and floating dry dock. Therefore, Electric Boat is requesting a modification to expand the currently existing security zone.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to modify the location of the existing security zone listed in 33 CFR 165.154(a)(2). Captain of the Port Long Island Sound proposes to add a new point in the definition of the security zone and replace two turning points. This would allow the zone to encompass the new building for construction of submarines and floating dry dock.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

Part 165 of 33 CFR contains specific regulated navigation areas and limited access areas to prescribe general regulations for different types of limited or controlled access areas and regulated navigation areas and list specific areas and their boundaries. Section 165.154 establishes Safety and Security Zones: Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone Safety and Security Zones.

The Coast Guard proposes to modify the location of the existing security zone listed in 33 CFR 165.154(a)(2)(i) Safety and Security Zones: Captain of the Port Zone Safety and Security Zones, to expand the zone, as indicate in the illustration below, to protect a new submarine construction facility and floating dry dock being built adjacent to the current facility.