

b. Use the active voice to address readers directly;

c. Use clear language rather than jargon;

d. Be divided into short sections and sentences; and

e. Use lists and tables wherever possible.

If you feel that we have not met these requirements, send us comments by one of the methods listed in the **ADDRESSES** section. To better help us revise the rule, your comments should be as specific as possible. For example, you should tell us the numbers of the sections or paragraphs that are unclearly written, which sections or sentences are too long, the sections where you believe lists or tables would be useful, etc.

#### M. Public Availability of Comments

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

#### N. E.O. 13771: Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs

This action is not an E.O. 13771 regulatory action because it imposes no more than *de minimis* costs.

#### List of Subjects in 25 CFR Part 169

Indians-lands, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Rights-of-way.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, proposes to amend 25 CFR part 169 as follows:

### PART 169—RIGHTS-OF-WAY OVER INDIAN LAND

■ 1. The authority citation for part 169 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 301; 25 U.S.C. 323–328; 25 U.S.C. 2201 *et seq.*

■ 2. Amend § 169.103 by adding paragraph (k) to read as follows:

#### § 169.103 What bonds, insurance, or other security must accompany the application?

\* \* \* \* \*

(k) The requirements of this section do not apply to Federal, State, Tribal, or local governments who are prohibited by law from providing a bond, insurance, or other security. Federal, State, Tribal, or local governments

seeking this exemption must include with their application a certification, including a citation to applicable law, that they are prohibited by law from providing security. Federal, State, Tribal, or local governments must also notify landowners that they are prohibited by law from providing security when they notify the Indian landowners of their application under § 169.107.

Dated: June 29, 2018.

**John Tahsuda,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs exercising the authority of the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 2018–15680 Filed 7–20–18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4337–15–P**

### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2018–0683]

RIN 1625–AA00

#### Safety Zone; Great Lakes Offshore Grand Prix; Lake Erie, Dunkirk, NY

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary safety zone for certain waters of Dunkirk Harbor, Lake Erie, Dunkirk, NY during the Great Lakes Offshore Grand Prix. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from being in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or a designated representative. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before August 7, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2018–0683 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://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 LCDR Michael Collet, Chief of Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard Sector Buffalo; telephone 716–843–9322, email [D09-SMB-SECBuffalo-WWM@uscg.mil](mailto:D09-SMB-SECBuffalo-WWM@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  
§ Section  
U.S.C. United States Code

#### II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On March 22, 2018, Dunkirk Local Development Corporation and Dunkirk Festivals notified the Coast Guard that it would be conducting a professional high speed powerboat race from 10:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on August 19, 2018. The race will be held in the vicinity of the Dunkirk Harbor. Hazards from the boat regatta include high speed vessels. The Captain of the Port Buffalo (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with the Great Lakes Offshore Grand Prix would be a safety concern for anyone within the designated safety zone.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to enhance the safety of vessels and racers on the navigable waters within the designated safety zone before, during, and after the scheduled event. The Coast Guard proposes this rulemaking under authority 33 U.S.C. 1231.

#### III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP proposes to establish a temporary safety zone enforced intermittently, from 10:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on August 19, 2018 with a rain date of August 18, 2018. The safety zone will encompass all navigable waters of Lake Erie, Dunkirk, NY starting at position 42°29′37.7″ N, 079°21′17.7″ W then Northwest to 42°29′45.2″ N, 079°21′28.2″ W then Northeast to 42°30′15.0″ N, 079°21′20.0″ W then Northeast to 42°30′39.0″ N, 079°19′46.0″ W then Southeast to 42°30′09.3″ N, 079°19′03.1″ W. The duration of the zone is intended to enhance the safety of vessels and these navigable waters before, during, and after the scheduled 10:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. boat races. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the safety zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. 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 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. Executive Order 13771 directs agencies to control regulatory costs through a budgeting process. 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), and pursuant to OMB guidance it is exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 13771.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, duration, and time-of-day of the safety zone. Vessel traffic would not be able to safely transit around this safety zone, which would impact a small designated area of Lake Erie. However, the Coast Guard would issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 about the zone, and the rule would allow vessels to seek permission to enter the zone.

### 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 the safety zone 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 contact 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 contact 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 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, 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 establishing a safety zone lasting 7 hours that would prohibit entry into all waters inside of Lake Erie, Dunkirk, NY starting at position 42°29′37.7″ N, 079°21′17.7″ W then Northwest to 42°29′45.2″ N, 079°21′28.2″ W then Northeast to 42°30′15.0″ N, 079°21′20.0″ W then Northeast to 42°30′39.0″ N, 079°19′46.0″ W then Southeast to 42°30′09.3″ N, 079°19′03.1″ W. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60(a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 01. A preliminary Record of Environmental Consideration (REC) supporting this determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. 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 contact 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 <http://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using [http://](http://www.regulations.gov)

[www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), contact the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, visit <http://www.regulations.gov/privacyNotice>.

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that website's instructions. 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 165

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

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes 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:** Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 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.T09–0683 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T09–0683 Safety Zone; Great Lakes Offshore Grand Prix; Lake Erie, Dunkirk, NY.

(a) *Location.* The safety zone will encompass all waters of Lake Erie, Dunkirk,

NY starting at position 42°29'37.7" N, 079°21'17.7" W then Northwest to 42°29'45.2" N, 079°21'28.2" W then Northeast to 42°30'15.0" N, 079°21'20.0" W then Northeast to 42°30'39.0" N, 079°19'46.0" W then Southeast to 42°30'09.3" N, 079°19'03.1" W.

(b) *Enforcement Period.* This rule is effective from 10:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on August 19, 2018 with a rain date of August 18, 2018.

(c) *Regulations.*

(1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into, transiting, or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his designated on-scene representative.

(2) This safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his designated on-scene representative.

(3) The “on-scene representative” of the Captain of the Port Buffalo is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port Buffalo to act on his behalf.

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone must contact the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative to obtain permission to do so. The Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with all directions given to them by the Captain of the Port Buffalo, or his on-scene representative.

Dated: July 17, 2018.

**Joseph S. Dufresne,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Buffalo.*

[FR Doc. 2018–15672 Filed 7–20–18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

### POSTAL SERVICE

#### 39 CFR Part 111

#### POSTNET Barcode

**AGENCY:** Postal Service™.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service is proposing an amendment of the *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service*, Domestic Mail Manual, (DMM®) to remove all references to the POSTNET™ barcode.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before August 22, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail or deliver written comments to the manager, Product Classification, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Room 4446, Washington, DC 20260–5015. If sending comments by email, include the name and address of the commenter and send to [ProductClassification@usps.gov](mailto:ProductClassification@usps.gov), with a subject line of “POSTNET.” Faxed comments are not accepted.

You may inspect and photocopy all written comments, by appointment only, at USPS® Headquarters Library, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, 11th Floor North, Washington, DC, 20260. These records are available for review on Monday through Friday, 9 a.m.–4 p.m., by calling 202–268–2906.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lizbeth Dobbins at (202) 268–3789 or Garry Rodriguez at (202) 268–7261.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On March 2, 2012, the Postal Service published a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** (77 FR 12764–12769) to discontinue automation price eligibility for POSTNET barcodes. This was followed by publication of a final rule in the **Federal Register** (77 FR 26185–26191) on May 3, 2012.

Effective January 27, 2013, the Postal Service revised the DMM throughout various sections to discontinue automation price eligibility based on the use of POSTNET barcodes on all types of mail. However, while the use of the POSTNET barcode was discontinued for price eligibility, the Postal Service continued to allow the use of the POSTNET barcode to qualify for certain Business Reply Mail® prices and in other circumstances. The DMM therefore retained language referring to POSTNET barcodes.

#### Proposal

As a result, after discussion with the mailing industry the Postal Service is proposing to remove all references to the POSTNET barcode from the DMM. This decision was based on the limited use of the POSTNET barcode and the need to simplify the standards in regards to barcoding letter-size and flat-size mailpieces.

The Postal Service will continue to process mailpieces with a POSTNET barcode to accommodate customers who may have preprinted stock bearing a POSTNET barcode.

Although exempt from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553(b), (c)) regarding proposed rulemaking by 39 U.S.C. 410(a), the Postal Service invites public comments on the following proposed revisions to *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service*, Domestic Mail Manual (DMM), incorporated by reference in the Code of Federal Regulations. See 39 CFR 111.1.

We will publish an appropriate amendment to 39 CFR part 111 to reflect these changes.

Accordingly, 39 CFR part 111 is proposed to be amended as follows:

#### List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 111

Administrative practice and procedure, Postal Service.

### PART 111—[AMENDED]

- 1. The authority citation for 39 CFR part 111 continues to read as follows: