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SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone covering the channel closure for the Northeast Shelter Island Channel Entrance. The safety zone is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment from potential hazards created by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Oil Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) Sensitive Site Strategy Evaluation Program (SSSEP) boom deployment exercise. Entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port Sector San Diego.

DATES: This rule is effective from 8:30 a.m. until 10:30 a.m. on June 22, 2021.

ADDRESSES: To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to https://www.regulations.gov, type USCG–2021–0435 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rule.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email LCDR John Santorum, Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Diego, Coast Guard; telephone 619–278–7656, email MarineEventsSD@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking

II. Background Information and Regulatory History

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency for good cause finds that such procedures are impracticable. The Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because NPRM would be impracticable. The Coast Guard did not receive the details of the OSPR SSSEP boom deployment exercise with enough time to solicit and respond to public comments on an NPRM. As such, the channel closure on June 22, 2021 would occur before an NPRM and final rule could be issued.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the Federal Register. Delaying the effective date of this rule would be contrary to the public interest, because action is necessary to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment from the dangers associated with the OSPR SSSEP boom deployment exercise on June 22, 2021.

III. Legal Authority and Need for Rule

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034 (previously 33 U.S.C. 1231). The Captain of the Port Sector San Diego (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with the OSPR SSSEP boom deployment exercise will be a safety concern to anyone.
seeking access to the Northeast Shelter Island Channel Entrance. This temporary safety zone is therefore needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in the navigable waters within the safety zone while the exercise is ongoing.

IV. Discussion of the Rule

This rule establishes a safety zone from 8:30 a.m. until 10:30 a.m. on June 22, 2021. The safety zone will cover the Northeast Shelter Island Channel Entrance and all navigable waters of San Diego Bay encompassed by a three hundred yard circle centered on the coordinate 32°43′13.7″N, longitude 117°13′7.8″W. No vessel may enter, transit through, anchor in, or remain in the zone during its enforcement unless permission is obtained from the COTP or a designated representative. The duration of the zone is intended to ensure the safety of, and reduce the risk to, the persons and vessels that operate on and in the vicinity of the Northeast Shelter Island Channel Entrance in the Sector San Diego’s Area of Responsibility. This TFR will close the Northeast Shelter Island Channel Entrance.

V. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this 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 rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, this rule has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on safety zone being of a limited duration, limited to a relatively small geographic area, and the presence of safety hazards in the area encompassing the Northeast Shelter Island Channel Entrance.

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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

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

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 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.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency’s responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247). 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.

C. Collection of Information

This rule will 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 rule under that Order and have determined that it is consistent with the federalism principles and preemption requirements described in Executive Order 13132.

Also, this rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does 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.

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 rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

F. Environment

We have analyzed this 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 determined 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 rule involves a safety zone lasting only 2 hours that will prohibit entry through the Northeast Shelter Island Channel entrance. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L.60(a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1. A 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.

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.

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 amends 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.T11–057 to read as follows:

§ 165.T11–057 Safety Zone; Southwest Shelter Island Channel Entrance Closure, San Diego, CA.

(a) Location. The following area is a safety zone: The Northeast Shelter Island Channel Entrance and all navigable waters of San Diego Bay encompassed by a three hundred yard circle centered on the coordinate 32°43'13.7" N, longitude 117°13'7.8" 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 Sector San Diego (COTP) in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(c) Regulations. (1) Under the general safety zone regulations in subpart C of this part, you may not enter the safety zone described in paragraph (a) of this section unless authorized by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

(2) To seek permission to enter, contact the COTP or the COTP’s representative by VHF Channel 16. Those in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

(d) Enforcement period. This section will be enforced from 8:30 a.m. until 10:30 a.m. on June 22, 2021.

Dated: June 16, 2021.

T.J. Barelli,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Sector San Diego.

[FR Doc. 2021–13136 Filed 6–21–21; 8:45 am]
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**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**34 CFR Chapter I**

**Enforcement of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 With Respect to Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Light of Bostock v. Clayton County**

**AGENCY:** Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Interpretation.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of Education (Department) issues this interpretation to clarify the Department’s enforcement authority over discrimination based on sexual orientation and discrimination based on gender identity under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in light of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Bostock v. Clayton County*. This interpretation will guide the Department in processing complaints and conducting investigations, but it does not itself determine the outcome in any particular case or set of facts.

**DATES:** This interpretation is effective June 22, 2021.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alejandro Reyes, Director, Program Legal Group, Office for Civil Rights. Telephone: (202) 245–7272. Email: Alejandro.Reyes@ed.gov.

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll-free, at 1–800–877–8339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background:** Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. 1681–1688, prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in any education program or activity offered by a recipient of Federal financial assistance. The Department’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) is responsible for the Department’s enforcement of Title IX.

OCR has long recognized that Title IX protects all students, including students who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender, from harassment and other forms of sex discrimination. OCR also has long recognized that Title IX prohibits harassment and other forms of discrimination against all students for not conforming to stereotypical notions of masculinity and femininity. But OCR at times has stated that Title IX’s prohibition on sex discrimination does not encompass discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

To ensure clarity, the Department issues this Interpretation addressing Title IX’s coverage of discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in light of the Supreme Court decision discussed below.

In 2020, the Supreme Court in *Bostock v. Clayton County*, 140 S. Ct. 1731, 590 U.S.____ (2020), concluded that discrimination based on sexual orientation and discrimination based on gender identity inherently involve treating individuals differently because of their sex. It reached this conclusion in the context of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq., which prohibits sex discrimination in employment. As noted below, courts rely on interpretations of Title VII to inform interpretations of Title IX.

The Department issues this Interpretation to make clear that the Department interprets Title IX’s prohibition on sex discrimination to encompass discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and to provide the reasons for this interpretation, as set out below.

**Interpretation:** Title IX Prohibits Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity.

Consistent with the Supreme Court’s ruling and analysis in *Bostock*, the Department interprets Title IX’s prohibition on sex discrimination “on the basis of sex” to encompass discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. As was the case for the Court’s Title VII analysis in *Bostock*, this interpretation flows from the statute’s “plain terms.” See *Bostock*, 140 S. Ct. at 1743, 1748–50.

Addressing discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity thus fits squarely within OCR’s responsibility to enforce Title IX’s prohibition on sex discrimination.

1. The Supreme Court’s Ruling in *Bostock*

The Supreme Court in *Bostock* held that sex discrimination, as prohibited by Title VII, encompasses discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. The Court explained that it is illegal to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity “requires an employer to intentionally treat individual employees differently because of their sex.” 140 S. Ct. at 1742.\(^1\) As the Court also explained,

\(^1\) The Court recognized that the parties in *Bostock* each presented a definition of “sex” dating back to Title VII’s enactment, with the employers’ definition referring to “reproductive biology” and the employees’ definition “capturing more than anatomical.” *Id.* 140 S. Ct. at 1739. The Court did not adopt a definition, instead “assuming” the definition of sex provided by the employers that the employees had accepted “for argument’s sake.” *Id.*

As the Court made clear, it did not need to adopt a definition of sex. Viewed in this light, the Department interprets Title IX’s prohibition on sex discrimination to encompass discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in light of the Supreme Court’s decision discussed above.