



**Homeland  
Security**

**Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation  
Decision Support System**

---

## **TIR - Safety Zone, Kernwood Avenue Bridge Repairs, Danver's River, Salem, Ma & Beverly, Ma - Project Approved**

### **Status**

---

- In Preparation (09/06/2024)
- Environmental Review (09/12/2024)
- Senior Environmental Review (09/12/2024)
- Proponent Review (09/12/2024)
- Project Approved (09/12/2024)

### **Project Information**

---

#### **General**

**Name:** TIR - Safety Zone, Kernwood Avenue Bridge Repairs, Danver's River, Salem, Ma & Beverly, Ma

**DSS ID:** DSS-USCG-2024-20625

**Security:** Unclassified

**Description:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone on the navigable waters at mile 1.0 Danvers River, within a 100-yard radius of the center point of the Kernwood Avenue Bridge between Salem, MA and Beverly, MA in approximate position 42.543312"N 070.898335"W.

The temporary safety zone is necessary to protect personnel, vessels and the marine environment from potential hazards created during bridge repairs. When enforced, entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port Boston or a designated representative.

**Funded through IRA?:** No

**Funded through the IIJA?:** No

**Critical Infrastructure?:** No

**Adopting Another Agency Catex, or CATEX Determination?:** No

**Project Type:** Administrative & Regulatory Activities - Regulations for Regulated Navigation Areas and security or safety zones: Regulations establishing or increasing the size of Regulated Navigation Areas and security or safety zones.(CATEX \*L60a)

**Existing EA/EIS?:** No

**Requires EA/EIS?:** No

**Project Priority:** Urgent

**Federal Assistance:** No

**Type of Permit:** N/A

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$0

## Component

**Component:** USCG - U.S. Coast Guard

**Region/Area/Unit:** USCG Civil Engineering Unit – Providence RI

**Tracking Number:** USCG-2024-0820

## Dates

**FY Funding:** 2024

**Proposed Project Start:** 09/15/2024

**Proposed Project End:** 12/31/2024

**Review Start:** 09/06/2024

## Project Location

---

- U.S. Territorial Water: Temporary safety zone on the navigable waters at mile 1.0 Danvers River, within a 100-yard radius of the center point of the Kernwood Avenue Bridge between Salem, MA and Beverly, MA, in approximate position 42.543312°N 070.898335°W

## Team

---

- Document Preparer, David Considine, david.m.considine@uscg.mil
- Collaborator-Document Preparation, Timothy Chase, Timothy.w.chase@uscg.mil
- Environmental Reviewer, Madeleine McNamara (Level I), madeleine.w.mcnamara@uscg.mil
- Senior Environmental Reviewer, Madeleine McNamara (Level I), madeleine.w.mcnamara@uscg.mil
- Proponent, Jessica Hull, Jessica.L.Hull@uscg.mil

## Categorical Exclusions

---

- L60(a)\* - Regulations for Regulated Navigation Areas and security or safety zones: Regulations establishing or increasing the size of Regulated Navigation Areas and security or safety zones.

## Required Conditions

---

1. Any change to the Proposed Action that may cause a physical interaction with the human environment will require re-evaluation for compliance with NEPA and other EP&HP requirements before the action can proceed.
2. This review addresses NEPA and other EP&HP requirements as described in DHS Directive 023-01. This review may identify the need for additional federal, state, and/or local permits, approvals, etc. required for the Proposed Action. However, this review may not satisfy those requirements and the Proponent is responsible for ensuring that all other appropriate federal, state, and/or local permits, approvals, etc. have been obtained.

## Decision Documents

---

- Record of Environmental Consideration (REC), 12.45kB

## Attachments

---

- Kernwood Bridge Safety Zone.docx, 1.48MB
- pre review USCG-2024-0820\_TIR SZ SECBOS KERNWOOD AVE BRIDGE(dpw).docx, 32.87kB

## Comments

---

- Madeleine McNamara (Level I), Environmental sensitivity determination of no effect by D1 EPS for the on-water activity associated with a safety zone for Kernwood Avenue Bridge repairs. (09/12/2024 08:54:40)
- Madeleine McNamara (Level I), The following natural resource agency mapping tools were utilized for effect determinations: USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC), NOAA Environmental Response Management Application (ERMA), NOAA Essential Fish Habitat Mapper (EFH), NOAA Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI), NOAA National Endangered Species Act (ESA) Critical Habitat Mapper, various state mapping tools for eelgrass, and the mapping tool for land areas of Federally-Recognized Tribes by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. (09/12/2024 08:53:55)
- Madeleine McNamara (Level I), The northern long-eared bat, tricolored bat, roseate tern, monarch butterfly are not present in the areas of on-water activity as each habitat is land-based. On-water actions associated with the establishment of the safety zone will have no effect on shellfish/invertebrates. Sturgeon (Atlantic and shortnose), essential fish habitat, and wetlands may be present in the area but will not be impacted by the proposed action. Eelgrass will not be impacted by the enforcement of the safety zone. (09/12/2024 08:53:17)
- Madeleine McNamara (Level I), The safety zone will not create significant effect on public health or safety. The proposed action will not have significant effect to environmental justice considerations; air quality; noise impacts; hazardous wastes and/or contamination; wastewater; potable water; or changes in modes or safety of transportation. The proposed action does not employ new or unproven technology that is likely to involve unique or unknown environmental risks, where the effect on the human environment is likely to be highly uncertain, or where the effect on the human environment is likely to be highly controversial in terms of scientific validity. The safety zone will have no effect on cultural or historic resources. There is no nexus between the enforcement of the safety zone and NHPA Section 106. There are no known effects waterside. Native lands are not present near the proposed on-water activity per mapping tool by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The enforcement of the safety zone has no nexus to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. (09/12/2024 08:52:16)

## EPHP Review

---

### Environmental Resources

- Is the Proposed Action a piece of a larger action or connected to another action? -- No  
Please explain how you came to this determination. : Safety zone for emergency bridge repairs.
- Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on public health or safety? Areas to consider include, but are not limited to: environmental justice considerations; air quality; noise impacts; hazardous wastes and/or contamination; wastewater; potable water; and changes in modes or safety of transportation. -- No  
Explain how the proposed action would not have a potentially significant effect on public health or safety. : USCG activities include safety zone enforcement during bridge repairs.
- Would the proposed action place a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on minority populations and low-income populations? -- No
- Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on species or habitats protected by the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, or Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act? -- No  
No  
Provide a conclusion under which statute the determination was made (e.g., no effect, NLAA, LAA, for ESA, etc.), how the determination was made, why it is considered significant, and copies of any consultation (informal and/or formal). : Coast Guard activities include enforcement of security zone. Not expected to have potentially significant effect on endangered species, marine mammals, migratory birds, bald or golden eagles.  
Attachments: FWS, NMFS, or Wildlife Agency Consultation: IPaC\_ Explore Location resources.pdf (IPaC\_ Explore Location resources.pdf, 736.83kB)
- What is your Endangered Species Act (ESA) finding and determination? -- No effect  
Explain how the determination was made (e.g., are species present in the area but your proposed action will have no effect? why?). Although not required, recommend attaching any consultation or correspondence conducted.: Northern Long-eared bats, Tricolored Bats, Roseate Terns, and Monarch butterflies are not expected to be impacted by the safety zone enforcement activities.  
  
See iPaC attachment  
Attachments: ESA consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- What is your Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) finding and determination? -- No effect or negligible effect  
Explain how the determination was made (e.g., are species present in the area but your proposed action will have no effect or negligible effects? why?). Although not required, recommend attaching any consultation or correspondence conducted.: Safety zone enforcement activities not expected to impact Marine Mammals.  
Attachments: MMPA consultation: ed17c446-303d-4815-b9cd-8f37bbdf3ea0.pdf (ed17c446-303d-

4815-b9cd-8f37bbdf3ea0.pdf, 1.84MB)

- Would the proposed action adversely affect a species protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act or Migratory Bird Treaty Act or habitat for such species? -- No  
Explain how the determination was made (e.g., are species present in the area but your proposed action will have no adverse effect or no significant effect? why?). Although not required, recommend attaching any consultation or correspondence conducted.: Safety zone enforcement by CG personnel not expected to adversely affect Bald or Golden Eagle. See IPaC document  
Attachments: BGEPA MBTA consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- What is your Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (essential fish habitat) finding and determination? -- No effect  
Attachments: EFH consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on an environmentally sensitive area? Examples include, but are not limited to: areas having special designation or recognition such as prime or unique agricultural lands, coastal zones, designated wilderness study areas, wild and scenic rivers, 100-year floodplains, wetlands, sole source aquifers, Marine Sanctuaries, National Wildlife Refuges, National Parks, National Monuments, etc. -- No
- Special Flood Hazard Area (i.e. floodplains) -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): On-water safety zone enforcement area is not in a Special Flood Hazard area
- Jurisdictional wetlands and Other Waters of the U.S. -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): On-water safety zone bot in wetlands
- Coastal Barrier Unit -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): No coastal barrier unit present in safety zone area.
- Coastal Zone Management Area -- Coastal Zone Management Area present  
Explain why the proposed action would not significantly impact these resources. : Coast guard activities are on-water safety zone enforcement. Activities will not affect Coastal Zona Management area.  
Attachments: CZMA consultation: Arc GIS MA Map.pdf (Arc GIS MA Map.pdf, 375.22kB)
- Section 10 navigable waterway -- Section 10 waterway present  
Explain why the proposed action would not significantly impact these resources. : On-water safety zone enforcement not expected to affect the Section 10 waterway
- Sole Source Aquifers and Wellheads -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action

located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): No Sole source aquifers or wellheads present in safety zone enforcement area

- Prime Farmland -- N/A

Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): On-water safety zone enforcement activities will not affect any prime farmlands.

- Designated land (i.e., Wilderness Area, Wild and Scenic River, Marine Sanctuary, National Park, National Monument, National Natural Landmark, Wildlife Refuge, and Wilderness Area -- N/A

Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): None present in safety zone area.

- Will the Proposed Action result in the potential violation of a Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed to protect the environment? -- No

Please summarize determination. : Proposed Action not expected to result in the potential violation of a Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed to protect the environment.

- Will the Proposed Action have an effect on the quality of the human environment that is likely to be highly controversial in terms of scientific validity, likely to be highly uncertain, or likely to involve unique or unknown environmental risks? -- No

Required: Please explain. : On-water enforcement of safety zone not expected to have an effect on the quality of the human environment.

- Will the Proposed Action employ new or unproven technology that is likely to involve unique or unknown environmental risks, where the effect on the human environment is likely to be highly uncertain, or where the effect on the human environment is likely to be highly controversial in terms of scientific validity? -- No

Required: Please explain.: No new or unproven technology will be used in the on-water enforcement of the safety zone.

- Will the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future actions that have significant effects? -- No

Please explain how you came to this determination. : The enforcement of the safety zone will not establish a precedent for future actions.

- Is the Proposed Action significantly greater in scope or size than normally experienced for its particular category of action? -- No

Required: Please summarize determination.: No similar actions have been conducted for multiple ongoing bridge projects in the State of Massachusetts.

- Will the Proposed Action have the potential to result in the significant degradation of existing poor environmental conditions? Will the Proposed Action initiate a potentially significant environmentally degrading influence, activity, or effect in areas not already significantly modified from their natural condition? -- No

Please explain how you came to this determination. : N/A

- Is the Proposed Action related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts? -- No

Please explain how you came to this determination. : N/A

- Are there any other requirements for the protection of the environment that need to be considered for this proposed action? -- No

### Historic Preservation & Cultural Resources

- Is the Proposed Action a piece of a larger action or connected to another action? -- No

Please explain how you came to this determination. : Safety zone for emergency bridge repairs.

- Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on public health or safety? Areas to consider include, but are not limited to: environmental justice considerations; air quality; noise impacts; hazardous wastes and/or contamination; wastewater; potable water; and changes in modes or safety of transportation. -- No

Explain how the proposed action would not have a potentially significant effect on public health or safety. : USCG activities include safety zone enforcement during bridge repairs.

- Would the proposed action place a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on minority populations and low-income populations? -- No
- Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on species or habitats protected by the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, or Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act? -- No

Provide a conclusion under which statute the determination was made (e.g., no effect, NLAA, LAA, for ESA, etc.), how the determination was made, why it is considered significant, and copies of any consultation (informal and/or formal). : Coast Guard activities include enforcement of security zone. Not expected to have potentially significant effect on endangered species, marine mammals, migratory birds, bald or golden eagles.

Attachments: FWS, NMFS, or Wildlife Agency Consultation: IPaC\_ Explore Location resources.pdf (IPaC\_ Explore Location resources.pdf, 736.83kB)

- What is your Endangered Species Act (ESA) finding and determination? -- No effect
- Explain how the determination was made (e.g., are species present in the area but your proposed action will have no effect? why?). Although not required, recommend attaching any consultation or correspondence conducted.: Northern Long-eared bats, Tricolored Bats, Roseate Terns, and Monarch butterflies are not expected to be impacted by the safety zone enforcement activities.

See iPaC attachment

Attachments: ESA consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)

- What is your Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) finding and determination? -- No effect or negligible effect

Explain how the determination was made (e.g., are species present in the area but your proposed

action will have no effect or negligible effects? why?). Although not required, recommend attaching any consultation or correspondence conducted.: Safety zone enforcement activities not expected to impact Marine Mammals.

Attachments: MMPA consultation: ed17c446-303d-4815-b9cd-8f37bbdf3ea0.pdf (ed17c446-303d-4815-b9cd-8f37bbdf3ea0.pdf, 1.84MB)

- Would the proposed action adversely affect a species protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act or Migratory Bird Treaty Act or habitat for such species? -- No  
Explain how the determination was made (e.g., are species present in the area but your proposed action will have no adverse effect or no significant effect? why?). Although not required, recommend attaching any consultation or correspondence conducted.: Safety zone enforcement by CG personnel not expected to adversely affect Bald or Golden Eagle. See IPaC document  
Attachments: BGEPA MBTA consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- What is your Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (essential fish habitat) finding and determination? -- No effect  
Attachments: EFH consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on an environmentally sensitive area? Examples include, but are not limited to: areas having special designation or recognition such as prime or unique agricultural lands, coastal zones, designated wilderness study areas, wild and scenic rivers, 100-year floodplains, wetlands, sole source aquifers, Marine Sanctuaries, National Wildlife Refuges, National Parks, National Monuments, etc. -- No
- Special Flood Hazard Area (i.e. floodplains) -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): On-water safety zone enforcement area is not in a Special Flood Hazard area
- Jurisdictional wetlands and Other Waters of the U.S. -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): On-water safety zone bot in wetlands
- Coastal Barrier Unit -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): No coastal barrier unit present in safety zone area.
- Coastal Zone Management Area -- Coastal Zone Management Area present  
Explain why the proposed action would not significantly impact these resources. : Coast guard activities are on-water safety zone enforcement. Activities will not affect Coastal Zona Management area.  
Attachments: CZMA consultation: Arc GIS MA Map.pdf (Arc GIS MA Map.pdf, 375.22kB)



- Section 10 navigable waterway -- Section 10 waterway present  
Explain why the proposed action would not significantly impact these resources. : On-water safety zone enforcement not expected to affect the Section 10 waterway
- Sole Source Aquifers and Wellheads -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): No Sole source aquifers or wellheads present in safety zone enforcement area
- Prime Farmland -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): On-water safety zone enforcement activities will not affect any prime farmlands.
- Designated land (i.e., Wilderness Area, Wild and Scenic River, Marine Sanctuary, National Park, National Monument, National Natural Landmark, Wildlife Refuge, and Wilderness Area -- N/A  
Explain why this resource is not applicable to your proposed action (e.g. is your proposed action located entirely within a building and no resources are present?): None present in safety zone area.
- Will the Proposed Action result in the potential violation of a Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed to protect the environment? -- No  
Please summarize determination. : Proposed Action not expected to result in the potential violation of a Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed to protect the environment.
- Will the Proposed Action have an effect on the quality of the human environment that is likely to be highly controversial in terms of scientific validity, likely to be highly uncertain, or likely to involve unique or unknown environmental risks? -- No  
Required: Please explain. : On-water enforcement of safety zone not expected to have an effect on the quality of the human environment.
- Will the Proposed Action employ new or unproven technology that is likely to involve unique or unknown environmental risks, where the effect on the human environment is likely to be highly uncertain, or where the effect on the human environment is likely to be highly controversial in terms of scientific validity? -- No  
Required: Please explain.: No new or unproven technology will be used in the on-water enforcement of the safety zone.
- Will the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future actions that have significant effects? -- No  
Please explain how you came to this determination. : The enforcement of the safety zone will not establish a precedent for future actions.
- Is the Proposed Action significantly greater in scope or size than normally experienced for its particular category of action? -- No  
Required: Please summarize determination.: No similar actions have been conducted for multiple ongoing bridge projects in the State of Massachusetts.

- Will the Proposed Action have the potential to result in the significant degradation of existing poor environmental conditions? Will the Proposed Action initiate a potentially significant environmentally degrading influence, activity, or effect in areas not already significantly modified from their natural condition? -- No

Please explain how you came to this determination. : N/A

- Is the Proposed Action related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts? -- No

Please explain how you came to this determination. : N/A

- Are there any other requirements for the protection of the environment that need to be considered for this proposed action? -- No

- Will the proposed action have a potentially significant effect on a district, highway, structure, or object that is listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places, a historic or cultural resource, traditional or sacred site, or result in the destruction of a significant scientific, cultural, or historic resource? -- No

Attachments: HR - Consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)

- What is the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 effect determination? -- No effect

Please explain how you came to this determination. : The on-water safety zone enforcement will not affect anything related to the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106.

Attachments: Section 106 consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)

- Does the proposed action limit access to, and ceremonial use of, Indian sacred sites on federal lands, by Indian religious practitioners, and/or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sites. -- No

## DHS Record of Environmental Consideration (REC) for Categorically Excluded Actions under NEPA

INTRODUCTION
<p>The purpose of this Record of Environmental Consideration (REC) is to provide a record that the potential for impacts to the quality of the human environment has been considered in the decision to implement the Proposed Action described below, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and DHS Directive 023-01 and Instruction Manual 023-01-001-01 on implementation of NEPA. DHS integrates the NEPA process with review and compliance requirements under other Federal laws, regulations, Executive Orders, and other requirements for the stewardship and protection of the human environment, as reflected in Section II (8) of this REC. Signature of the DHS Proponent on this REC demonstrates that they have considered the potential for impacts to the human environment in their decision to implement the Proposed Action as required by NEPA, and are committing to any conditions listed in Section IV of this REC that may be required for implementation of the project. When completed, the form is to be signed by the Preparer, the Environmental Approver, and the Action Proponent. The completed REC becomes a part of the administrative record for the Proposed Action.</p>
SECTION I - Description of Proposed Action
<p>1. Name of Component Authorizing the Proposed Action: U.S. Coast Guard USCG Civil Engineering Unit – Providence RI</p>
<p>2. Title of Proposed Action: TIR - Safety Zone, Kernwood Avenue Bridge Repairs, Danver's River, Salem, Ma &amp; Beverly, Ma</p>
<p>3. Identifying Number of Proposed Action: DSS-USCG-2024-20625</p>
<p>4. Estimated Start Date and Useful Life of Proposed Action: Start Date: 09/15/2024 - End Date: 12/31/20</p>
<p>5. Location of Proposed Action: U.S. Territorial Water: Temporary safety zone on the navigable waters at mile 1.0 Danvers River, within a 100-yard radius of the center point of the Kernwood Avenue Bridge between Salem, MA and Beverly, MA, in approximate position 42.543312°N 070.898335°W</p>
<p>6. Description of Proposed Action: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone on the navigable waters at mile 1.0 Danvers River, within a 100-yard radius of the center point of the Kernwood Avenue Bridge between Salem, MA and Beverly, MA in approximate position 42.543312°N 070.898335°W.  The temporary safety zone is necessary to protect personnel, vessels and the marine environment from potential hazards created during bridge repairs. When enforced, entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port Boston or a designated representative.</p>
SECTION II - Analysis of Extraordinary Circumstances
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed Action is not a piece of a larger action <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Action is a piece of a larger action Remarks:</p>
<p>8. For A through K, check the appropriate box and provide an explanation when appropriate. Include a summary of any coordination or consultation that occurred with a resource or regulatory agency, if relevant.</p>

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>A. Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on public health or safety?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>B. Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on species or habitats protected by the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, or Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>C. Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on a district, highway, structure, or object that is listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)? Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on a historic or cultural resource, traditional or sacred site, or result in the destruction of a significant scientific, cultural, or historic resource?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>D. Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on an environmentally sensitive area?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>E. Will the Proposed Action result in the potential violation of a Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed to protect the environment?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>F. Will the Proposed Action have an effect on the quality of the human environment that is likely to be highly controversial in terms of scientific validity, likely to be highly uncertain, or likely to involve unique or unknown environmental risks?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>G. Will the Proposed Action employ new or unproven technology that is likely to involve unique or unknown environmental risks, where the effect on the human environment is likely to be highly uncertain, or where the effect on the human environment is likely to be highly controversial in terms of scientific validity?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>H. Will the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future actions that have significant effects?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>I. Is the Proposed Action significantly greater in scope or size than normally experienced for its particular category of action?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>J. Does the Proposed Action have the potential to result in significant degradation of existing poor environmental conditions? Will the Proposed Action initiate a potentially significant environmentally degrading influence, activity, or effect in areas not significantly modified from their natural condition?</p> <p>Remarks:</p>

Yes  No K. Is the Proposed Action related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts?

Remarks:

**SECTION III - Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) Determination**

9. This action is not expected to result in any significant adverse environmental impacts as described in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The proposed action has been thoroughly reviewed by the U.S. Coast Guard and it has been determined, by the undersigned, that this action is categorically excluded under current DHS CATEX **L60(a)\*** from further environmental documentation, in accordance with Section 3 of DHS Directive 023-01, Environmental Planning Program since implementation of this action:

I. Clearly fits within one or more of the categories of excludable actions listed in Appendix A of DHS Instruction 023-01-001-01;

II. Is not a piece of a larger action which has been segmented into smaller parts in order to avoid a more extensive evaluation of the potential for significant environmental impacts;

III. Does not involve any extraordinary circumstances, as defined in DHS Instruction 023-01-001-01, Section V(B)(2), that would create the potential for a normally excluded action to have a significant environmental effect.

**SECTION IV - Conditions**

10. The following conditions are required to implement the Proposed Action:

Any change to the Proposed Action that may cause a physical interaction with the human environment will require re-evaluation for compliance with NEPA and other EP&HP requirements before the action can proceed.

This review addresses NEPA and other EP&HP requirements as described in DHS Directive 023-01. This review may identify the need for additional federal, state, and/or local permits, approvals, etc. required for the Proposed Action. However, this review may not satisfy those requirements and the Proponent is responsible for ensuring that all other appropriate federal, state, and/or local permits, approvals, etc. have been obtained.

**SECTION V - Signatures**

11a. Preparer of this REC

Name: David Considine	Digitally signed by David Considine at 09/06/2024 1:06 PM  David Considine	Date: 09/06/2024
--------------------------	---	---------------------

11b. Environmental Approver of this REC

Name: Madeleine McNamara (Level I)	Digitally signed by Madeleine McNamara (Level I) at 09/12/2024 8:56 PM  Madeleine McNamara (Level I)	Date: 09/12/2024
---------------------------------------	---	---------------------

11c. Action Proponent

<p>Name: Jessica Hull</p>	<p>Digitally signed by Jessica Hull at 09/12/2024 9:20 PM  Jessica Hull</p>	<p>Date: 09/12/2024</p>
-------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

## Preview of Attachments

---

The following pages will display this project's attachments that are of these file types:

- .jpg /.jpeg
- .png
- .gif
- .txt
- .pdf

The attachments of compatible file types from this project are:

### Note:

All project attachments can be downloaded at the 'File Upload/Manage Attachments' page.