

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.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

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

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard is proposing to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREA AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 46 U.S.C. 70034, 70051; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 165.T08–0379 to read as follows:

§ 165.T08–0379 Safety Zone; Lake Charles, Lake Charles, Louisiana.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: All navigable waters of the Lake Charles west of 93°13'51.2" W, east of 93°14'8.3" W, and extending 500 yards south from the northern shore of Lake Charles. The duration of the safety zone is intended to protect participants, spectators, and other persons and vessels, on the navigable waters of the Lake Charles during the watercross races.

(b) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from 8 a.m. through 6 p.m. on August 28, 2021 and August 29, 2021.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23, entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Marine Safety Unit Port Arthur (COTP) or a designated representative. They may be contacted on VHF–FM channel 13 or 16, or by phone at by telephone at 337–912–0073.

(2) The COTP or a designated representative may forbid and control the movement of all vessels in the regulated area. When hailed or signaled by an official patrol vessel, a vessel shall come to an immediate stop and comply with the directions given. Failure to do so may result in expulsion from the area, citation for failure to comply, or both.

(3) The COTP or a designated representative may terminate the event or the operation of any vessel at any time it is deemed necessary for the protection of life or property.

(4) The COTP or a designated representative will terminate enforcement of the special local regulations at the conclusion of the event.

(d) *Informational broadcasts.* The COTP or a designated representative will inform the public of the effective period for the safety zone as well as any changes in the dates and times of enforcement through Local Notice to Mariners (LNMs), Broadcast Notices to Mariners (BNMs), and/or Marine Safety Information Bulletins (MSIBs) as appropriate.

Dated: May 27, 2021.

Molly A. Wike,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Marine Safety Unit Port Arthur.

[FR Doc. 2021–11584 Filed 6–2–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2021–0208]

RIN 1625–AA87

Security Zones; Lewes and Rehoboth Canal and Atlantic Ocean, Rehoboth, DE

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to establish two security zones for certain waters of Rehoboth Beach to prevent waterside threats and incidents for persons under the protection of the United States Secret Service (USSS) in the vicinity of Rehoboth Beach, Delaware. These security zones would be enforced intermittently and only for the protection of persons protected by USSS when in the area and will restrict vessel traffic while the zone is being enforced. This rule would prohibit vessels and people from entering the zones unless specifically exempt under the provisions of this rule or granted specific permission from the Captain of the Port (COTP) Delaware Bay or a designated representative. Any vessel requesting to transit the zones without pause or delay, will typically be authorized to do so by on scene enforcement vessels. We invite your comments on this proposed rule.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before July 19, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–

2021–0208 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 Petty Officer Edmund Ofalt, U.S. Coast Guard, Sector Delaware Bay, Waterways Management Division; telephone 215–271–4889, email Edmund.J.Ofalt@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

BNM Broadcast Notice to Mariners
CFR Code of Federal Regulations
COTP Captain of the Port
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
OMB Office of Management and Budget
§ Section
U.S.C. United States Code
USSS United States Secret Service

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On occasion, persons protected by the USSS under 18 U.S.C. 3056 or pursuant to Presidential memorandum will visit Rehoboth Beach, Delaware, and the surrounding vicinity. These visits require the implementation of heightened security measures for persons protected by the USSS who may be present in the vicinity of Rehoboth Beach, Delaware. Due to the close proximity of the Lewes and Rehoboth canal, and the Atlantic Ocean, these security zones are necessary for USSS protectees, the public, and the surrounding waterway.

The purpose of this proposed rulemaking is to protect USSS protectees and the public from destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage, subversive acts, or other malicious or potential terrorist acts. The Coast Guard is proposing this rulemaking under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034 (previously 33 U.S.C. 1231), as delegated by Department of Homeland Security Delegation no. 0170.1, section II, paragraph 70, from the Secretary of DHS to the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, and further redelegated by 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5 to the Captains of the Port.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP is proposing to establish two security zones for the protection of USSS protectees when present in the vicinity of Rehoboth Beach, Delaware. This rule is necessary to expedite the

establishment and enforcement of these security zones when short notice is provided to the COTP for USSS protectees who may be present in the area.

Security Zone One is bounded on the north by a line drawn from 38° 44.36' North Latitude (N), 075° 5.32' West Longitude (W), thence easterly to 38° 44.37' N, 075° 5.31' W proceeding from shoreline to shoreline on the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal in a Southeasterly direction where it is bounded by a line drawn from 38° 43.89' N, 075° 5.31' W, thence easterly to 38° 43.90' N, 075° 5.07' W thence northerly across the entrance to the yacht basin to 38° 43.93' N, 075° 5.09' W.

Security Zone Two extends 500 yards seaward from the shoreline, into the Atlantic Ocean beginning at 38° 44.86' N, 075° 4.83' W, proceeding southerly along the shoreline to 38° 43.97' N, 075° 4.70' W.

These security zones may be activated individually or simultaneously with respect to the presence of USSS protectees. These zones will be enforced intermittently. Enforcement of these zones will be broadcast via Broadcast Notice to Mariners (BNM) and/or local Safety Marine Information Broadcast (SMIB) on VHF-FM marine channel 16, as well as actual notice via on scene Coast Guard Personnel. The public can learn the status of the security zone via an information release for the public via website <https://homeport.uscg.mil/my-homeport/coast-guard-prevention/waterway-management?cotpid=40>.

No vessel or person would be permitted to enter either security zone without first obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. However, we anticipate that vessels requesting to transit these zones would typically be authorized to transit without pause or delay by on-scene enforcement vessels. When a vessel or person is permitted to enter

the security zone after obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative, the vessel or person must proceed as directed by on scene enforcement vessels. Any vessel or person permitted to transit the security zone would be required to continue through the zone without pause or delay as directed by on scene enforcement vessels. No vessel or person will be permitted to stop or anchor in the security zone. At times, for limited duration, it is anticipated that vessels may be prohibited from entering the zone due to movement of persons protected by USSS. During those times, actual notice will be given to vessels in the area.

When these security zones are enforced, the COTP would issue a BNM and/or SMIB via VHF-FM channel 16. The public can learn the status of the security zone via an information release for the public via website <https://homeport.uscg.mil/my-homeport/coast-guard-prevention/waterway-management?cotpid=40>.

The regulatory text we are proposing 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 (“Regulatory Planning and Review”) and 13563 (“Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review”) 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 (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety

effects, distributive impacts, and equity). Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has not designated this proposed rule a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, OMB has not reviewed it. A combined regulatory analysis (RA) and Regulatory Flexibility Analysis follows.

This proposed rule would establish the following two security zones: (1) A half-mile stretch of the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal; and (2) a one-mile section of Rehoboth Beach stretching 500 yards from the shoreline. The enforcement of these two security zones is expected to be intermittent. Vessels would normally be allowed to transit but not stop within the security zones. However, when persons protected by the USSS are moving in or out of the area, the Coast Guard may halt traffic in these two security zones. The Coast Guard expects such instances to happen relatively infrequently and for a short duration (1–3 hours).

In order to implement this rule, the Coast Guard proposes to station Coast Guard personnel at the borders of the security zones with the authority to enforce this security zone. In the few instances where USSS protectees are in transit, these Coast Guard personnel would ensure that no traffic transits through the security zones. Recreational boaters wishing to transit the area may inquire directly with the Coast Guard personnel posted at the boundaries of the security zones, rather than being required to contact the COTP.

Table 1 provides a summary of the proposed rule’s costs and qualitative benefits.

TABLE 1—SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED RULE’S IMPACTS

Category	Summary
Potentially Affected Population.	This rule would impact recreational boaters wishing to use the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal or the North Shores section of Rehoboth Beach.
Unquantified Costs.	Recreational boaters of the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal would need to speak with Coast Guard personnel stationed at the entrances of the security zones. These recreational boaters would be informed that they will be unable to stop or loiter inside the security zone. In certain instances where persons protected by USSS are in transit, traffic may be halted on the Lewes Rehoboth canal. In these instances, recreational boaters wishing to use the canal would instead need to take a circuitous route or forgo their trip all together.
Unquantified Benefits.	This rule would secure the area to meet objectives of the USSS and keep USSS protectees safe.

Affected Population

The Coast Guard does not collect data on the vessels and individuals using either the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal or the North Shores Section of Rehoboth Beach, the areas that would be impacted by this proposed rule. To estimate the affected population, we used information directly observable from Google Maps, as well as the subject-matter expertise of Coast Guard personnel with knowledge of the area.

The proposed two security zones—a half-mile section of the Lewes Rehoboth Canal and a one-mile section of

Rehoboth Beach—are distinct. As such, we assess the affected populations for these two areas separately.

(1) Security Zone 1: Lewes Rehoboth Canal

This proposed regulation would impact any recreational boater wishing to transit the Lewes Rehoboth Canal. The Lewes Rehoboth Canal is about 10 miles long and connects the Broadkill River and the Delaware Bay to Rehoboth Bay. The security zone would begin approximately two-thirds of the way through the canal (if starting from the Delaware Bay) and last for about a half

mile. As such, recreational boaters wishing to transit the canal from the communities of Lewes, Dewey Beach, North Shores, Rehoboth Beach, and West Rehoboth may be impacted by this proposed rule.¹

These communities are seasonal; their populations are much larger and more active in the summer than in the winter. Vessel traffic in the canal follows the same pattern. Coast Guard officers stationed in this region estimated the numbers of vessels transiting this zone per day by season. We present these estimates in table 2.

TABLE 2—VESSEL TRAFFIC BY TIME OF YEAR

Months	Vessels transiting the canal per day
January through March	20 vessels per day.
April	75 vessels per day.
May through September	More than 200 vessels per day.
October through December	50 vessels per day.

The vessel traffic in the canal is entirely recreational. There are no commercial vessels that transit the canal. Moreover, the canal is quite shallow. The Coast Guard’s 27-foot vessels navigate the canal with difficulty because of the depth. Kayaks, canoes, and other manually powered watercraft are frequently used in the canal (not counted in the daily vessel traffic estimates).

In addition to the daily traffic of recreational boaters wishing to transit the security zone, there are a number of boat slips located either within the security zone or require transiting the security zone to access. There are also houses that border sections of the canal wholly inside the security zone. We reviewed satellite images from Google Maps to identify the number of boat slips within the security zone or require transiting the security zone to access. Based on these satellite images, we estimate that 17 private houses that lie entirely within the canal security zone contain either a boat slip or dock. The boat slips indicate that recreational vessel usage might be undertaken by the owners or occupiers of these properties. Because they lie fully inside the security zone, they would be impacted every time they took out their vessels.

Additionally, a small man-made canal branches off the main Lewes and Rehoboth Canal and leads into a small man-made lake. The southern edge of the safety zone continues just past the entrance to this second canal. Private

houses and the North Shores Marina inhabit the land surrounding the second canal and its adjoining lake. Some of these houses contain docks or boat slips. Recreational vessel operators would require transiting through the security zone to reach either the boat slips at these private homes or the North Shores Marina. Use of this canal and lake is primarily local and by small recreational vessels, as this second canal may only be 3 feet deep in certain places. Using Google Maps, we count 14 boat slips or docks connected to private houses and 30 spaces for recreational vessels at the North Shores Marina.

(2) Security Zone 2: Rehoboth Beach

This proposed rule would also impact any recreational boaters that would transit the area 1 mile by 500 yards offshore of the North Shores section of Rehoboth Beach. Because of its proximity to the shore, the Coast Guard does not estimate than any recreational boaters or commercial vessels routinely operate in this section of the ocean. Vessels operating this close to shore could face additional hazards due to the surf and other marine currents and would avoid this area.

Costs

As above, we assess the costs to the two security zones separately.

(1) Security Zone 1: Lewes and Rehoboth Canal

In table 2, we present the Coast Guard’s estimate of the average vessel

traffic. Under normal course of operations, the Coast Guard anticipates that recreational boaters transiting the canal would have a very brief conversation with the Coast Guard official stationed at the entrance to the security zone. Recreational boaters would then proceed through the security zone (without stopping or loitering) and exit the security zone. We anticipate that this conversation would last between 15 and 30 seconds per recreational boater. Because we do not know how many recreational boaters are on the average boat and because of how small the amount of time per recreational boaters is likely to be, we do not estimate the total costs of these conversations.

Additionally, above we discussed that there are a number of houses and a marina that are contained within the security zone or would require transiting the security zone in order to access. The Coast Guard observes that recreational vessel operators who reside or are visiting a location inside the security zone should be able to relay this information to the Coast Guard personnel stationed at the entrance of the security zone. When recreational boaters provide this additional information, it may increase the duration of the conversation. However, there are only 17 houses with private docks or boat slips contained within the security zone. It is likely, therefore, that the Coast Guard personnel stationed at either end of the security zone would

¹Dewey Beach lies on the isthmus between Rehoboth Bay and the Atlantic Ocean south of

Rehoboth beach and north of the Delaware Seashore State Park.

become aware of these vessels and their owners and operators. As a result, conversations may become more brief overtime.

In order to access the private docks and boat slips of the 14 houses and the North Shores Marina, recreational vessel operators would need to transit through a small portion of the security zone. The Coast Guard would interpret the vessels seeking to access this second canal as innocent passage. As a result, the Coast Guard personnel do not intend to converse with recreational boaters intending to access the second canal unless they notice suspicious activity. Instead, Coast Guard personnel would report vessels transiting the second canal to the USSS representatives. Because Coast Guard personnel would not converse with the recreational vessel operators transiting this region, we estimate that there would be no costs on boaters who only pass through the lower stretch of the canal security zone in order to access the North Shores Marina or the private houses on the canal or lake.

The costs discussed above cover the normal operations when access to the canal is still permitted. However, when certain individuals protected by USSS are transiting the area, the Coast Guard may shut down access to the canal. Such closures could last from 1 to 3 hours, or longer. If the security zone is closed to all traffic, recreational boaters would not be able to transit the length of the canal. Recreational boaters wishing to transit through the security zone would be unable to do so.

If this closure happens suddenly, recreational boaters could be stranded on either side of the canal. The distance through the canal is about 10 miles, but to avoid the canal by taking a more circuitous route around Rehoboth Beach would add 25 miles to the journey. Additionally, a significant portion of this distance requires operations in the Atlantic Ocean. The Atlantic Ocean is considerably rougher than the intracoastal waterways. As a result, many of the recreational watercraft unable to transit the security zone may be unable to take an alternate route, either because they may not have a vessel suitable to a coastwise route or may not have the time to add an additional 25 miles on to the journey.

Because we do not know the frequency or duration of full closures of the security zone, we are unable to quantitatively assess the costs to either temporarily stranded vessel operators or to vessel operators wishing to transit the closed waterway. Public comments as to

the frequency and use of the canal in this security zone are encouraged.²

(2) Security Zone 2: North Shores Section of Rehoboth Beach on the Atlantic Ocean

We do not estimate that any vessels would routinely operate in this section of Rehoboth Beach, as discussed in the Affected Population section above. Additionally, were recreational vessel operators to transit this security zone, it is far easier to exit or avoid the security zone than in the canal. Recreational boaters merely would need to be greater than 500 yards from shore. As a result, we do not estimate any costs incurred by the second proposed security zone.

Benefits

Upon request by the USSS for the Coast Guard to implement security measures in certain sections of the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal and certain sections offshore from Rehoboth Beach, the Coast Guard is proposing to create two security zones covering these areas. The security zones are necessary to prevent waterside threats and incidents that could impact the safety and security of USSS protectees when present in the area.

Both security zones aid the USSS in controlling the area and preventing actors wishing to cause harm to the functioning of the U.S. Government by attacking persons protected by the USSS. Were such an attack to be attempted or to occur, the societal impacts could be sizable and potentially severe to the Nation's Government. Additionally, the local impacts would be substantial as well. The area could be closed for a significant period as any necessary investigations occur. This proposed regulatory action would greatly decrease the likelihood of these potential impacts. The Coast Guard has no way to quantify the frequency of malfeasant actors or the extent to which this proposed rule would diminish the frequency of their attempted or successful actions. However, we believe that the value of these benefits would be greater than the costs of the proposed regulation.

Regulatory Alternatives Considered

We considered alternatives to the proposed regulatory action to determine if an alternative could accomplish the stated objectives of applicable statutes and could minimize any economic impact on small entities. In developing

² Details as to what type of boat or vessel, the frequency, number of people usually onboard, and the location from which the vessel came from are requested.

this rule, the Coast Guard considered the following alternatives:

Alternative 1: No Action/Status Quo

Without this proposed rule, malfeasant actors could have unfettered access to locations near persons protected by USSS. We believe that this unfettered access presents an unacceptable security risk to the United States. As such, we rejected this alternative.

Alternative 2: Do Not Permit any Traffic Inside the Security Zone

The Coast Guard considered closing the security zone to traffic entirely, which would have had the added cost of making it impossible to fully transit the canal. We rejected this alternative because there are potentially over 200 recreational boaters a day transiting the proposed security zones in the summer. These boaters would lose their ability to have recreational access of the waterway and any enjoyment that provides them. Additionally, 31 homes with boat slips and a marina with 30 spots are inaccessible without transiting the security zones. These homes, despite existing on the canal with a dock, would be unable to use the waterway. Consequently, we rejected this alternative because the costs would be too high.

Alternative 3: Allow Vessels To Transit the Waterway, But Do Not Permit Vessels To Transit During the Movement of Certain Individuals Protected by USSS

This is our preferred alternative and discussed throughout the regulatory analysis. We believe it balances the costs to public in the form of quick conversations with transiting recreational vessels and the occasional inconvenience of a temporary canal closure due to USSS protectees moving around the area with the benefits of ensuring the security of these protected persons.

B. Impact on 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 effect 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 people.

As discussed above, the affected population is entirely recreational. As a result, the individuals impacted by this

proposed rule cannot be small entities fitting the definitions set out by the Regulatory Flexibility Act. Based on this analysis, we found this proposed rulemaking, if promulgated, would not affect a substantial number of small entities.

Therefore, 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. 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. 4321–4370(f)), 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 two security zones for the protection of USSS protectees while present in the vicinity of Rehoboth Beach, Delaware. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L[60a] of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1. A preliminary Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket. For instructions on locating the docket, see the **ADDRESSES** section of this preamble. 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).

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and 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. 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 165

Harbors, Marine Safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard is proposing to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

- 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 46 U.S.C. 70034, 70051; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

- 2. Add § 165.561 to read as follows:

§ 165.561 Security Zones; Lewes and Rehoboth Canal and Atlantic Ocean, Rehoboth Beach, DE.

(a) *Location.* The following area are security zones; these coordinates are based on North American Datum 83 (NAD83):

(1) *Security zone one:* All waters of the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal bounded on the north by a line drawn from 38° 44.35' North Latitude (N), 075° 5.32' West Longitude (W), thence easterly to 38° 44.37' N, 075° 5.31' W proceeding from shoreline to shoreline on the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal in a Southeasterly direction where it is bounded by a line drawn from 38° 43.89' N, 075° 5.31' W, thence easterly to 38° 43.90' N, 075° 5.07' W thence northerly across the entrance to the yacht basin to 38° 43.93' N, 075° 5.09' W.

(2) *Security zone two:* All waters of the Atlantic Ocean extending 500 yards seaward from a line beginning at 38° 44.86' N, 075° 4.86' W, proceeding southerly along the shoreline to 38° 43.97' N, 075° 4.70' W.

(b) *Definitions.* As used in this section—

Designated representative means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard coxswain, petty officer, or other officer operating a Coast Guard vessel and a Federal, State, and local officer designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port Delaware Bay (COTP) in the enforcement of the security zone.

USSS protectee means any person for whom the United States Secret Service requests implementation of a security zone in order to supplement protection of said person(s).

Official patrol vessel means any Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, State, or local law enforcement vessel assigned or approved by the COTP.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations contained in § 165.33 of this part, entry into or movement within this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the COTP, Sector Delaware Bay, or designated representative.

(2) Entry into or remaining in a security zone described in paragraph (a) of this section is prohibited unless authorized by the COTP or designated representative when the security zones are being enforced. At the start of each enforcement, all persons and vessels within the security zone must depart the zones immediately or obtain authorization from the COTP or designated representative to remain within either zone. All vessels authorized to remain in the zone(s) must

proceed as directed by the COTP or designated representative.

(3) A person or vessel operator who intends to enter or transit the security zones while the zones are being enforced must obtain authorization from the COTP or designated representative. While the zones are being enforced the COTP or designated representative will determine access to the zones on a case-by-case basis. A person or vessel operator requesting permission to enter or transit the security zone may contact the COTP or designated representative at 215-271-4807 or on marine band radio VHF-FM channel 16 (156.8 MHz), or by visually or verbally hailing the on-scene law enforcement vessel enforcing the zone. On-scene Coast Guard personnel enforcing this section can be contacted on marine band radio, VHF-FM channel 16 (156.8 MHz). The operator of a vessel must proceed as directed upon being hailed by a U.S. Coast Guard vessel, or other Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency vessel, by siren, radio, flashing light, or other means. When authorized by the COTP or designated representative to enter the security zone all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the COTP or designated representative and proceed at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe course while within the security zone.

(4) Upon being hailed by a U.S. Coast Guard vessel, or other Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency vessel, by siren, radio, flashing light or other means, a person or operator of a vessel must proceed as directed. Failure to comply with lawful direction may result in expulsion from the regulated area, citation for failure to comply, or both.

(5) Unless specifically authorized by on scene enforcement vessels, no vessel or person will be permitted to stop or anchor in the security zone. A vessel granted permission to enter or transit within the security zone(s) must do so without delay or pause for the entirety of its time within the boundaries of the security zone(s). At times, for limited duration, it is anticipated that vessels may be prohibited from entering the zone due to movement of persons protected by USSS. During those times, the Coast Guard will provide actual notice to vessels in the area.

(6) The U.S. Coast Guard may secure the entirety of either or both security zones if deemed necessary to address security threats or concerns.

(7) The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted by Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in the patrol and enforcement of the security zone

described in paragraph (a) of this section.

(d) *Enforcement.* (1) The Coast Guard activates the security zones when requested by the U.S. Secret Service for the protection of individuals who qualify for protection under 18 U.S.C 3056(a) or Presidential memorandum. The COTP will provide the public with notice of enforcement of security zone by Broadcast Notice to Mariners (BNM), information release at the website: <https://homeport.uscg.mil/my-homeport/coast-guard-prevention/waterway-management?cotpid=40> as well as on-scene notice by designated representative or other appropriate means in accordance with 33 CFR 165.7.

(2) These security zones may be enforced individually or simultaneously.

Dated: May 27, 2021.

Jonathan D. Theel,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Delaware Bay.

[FR Doc. 2021-11764 Filed 6-2-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 20

International Mailing Services: Price Changes

AGENCY: Postal Service™.

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service proposes to revise *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service*, International Mail Manual (IMM®), to reflect changes coincident with the recently announced mailing services price adjustments.

DATES: We must receive your comments on or before July 6, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Mail or deliver comments to the manager, Product Classification, U.S. Postal Service®, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, RM 4446, Washington, DC 20260-5015. You may inspect and photocopy all written comments at USPS® Headquarters Library, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, 11th Floor N, Washington DC by appointment only between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday by calling 1-202-268-2906 in advance. Email comments, containing the name and address of the commenter, to: PCFederalRegister@usps.gov, with a subject line of "August 2021 International Mailing Services Proposed Price Changes." Faxed comments are not accepted. All submitted comments and attachments are part of the public