



**Homeland  
Security**

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

---

## **USCG-2024-0607 Security Zone; Santa Monica Bay, Pacific Palisades, CA - Project Approved**

### **Status**

---

- In Preparation (07/03/2024)
- Environmental Review (07/03/2024)
- Senior Environmental Review (07/03/2024)
- Proponent Review (07/30/2024)
- Project Approved (07/30/2024)

### **Project Information**

---

#### **General**

**Name:** USCG-2024-0607 Security Zone; Santa Monica Bay, Pacific Palisades, CA

**DSS ID:** DSS-USCG-2024-19989

**Security:** Unclassified

**Description:** The Coast Guard is proposing to establish a temporary security zone for certain waters of Santa Monica Bay. This action is necessary to provide for the security of life on these navigable waters near Will Rogers State Beach, Pacific Palisades, CA, during a beachfront event on August 11, 2024. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from being in the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Sector Los Angeles-Long Beach or a designated representative. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

**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:** Normal

**Federal Assistance:** No

**Type of Permit:** Marine Event Permit

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$0

#### **Component**

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

**Region/Area/Unit:** USCG Civil Engineering Unit – Oakland Ca

## Dates

**FY Funding:** 2024

**Proposed Project Start:** 08/11/2024

**Proposed Project End:** 08/11/2024

**Review Start:** 07/03/2024

## Project Location

---

- State-/Territory-Wide: California

## Team

---

- Document Preparer, Ronald Sampert, ronald.j.sampert@uscg.mil
- Collaborator-Document Preparation, Katherine DeHart, Katherine.G.DeHart@uscg.mil
- Environmental Reviewer, William Robinson (Level III), william.a.robinson@uscg.mil
- Senior Environmental Reviewer, William Robinson (Level III), william.a.robinson@uscg.mil
- Proponent, Stacey Crecy, stacey.l.crecy@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

---

- There are no attachments.

## Comments

---

- There are no comments.

## 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. : The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the security of personnel and the navigable waters within a 500-yard radius of the beachfront event before, during, and after the scheduled event. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the security zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative.
- 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. : This proposed rule involves a security zone lasting 12.5 hours that would prohibit entry within 500 yards of a beachfront event. 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. 1
- 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). : This proposed rule involves a security zone lasting 12.5 hours that would prohibit entry within 500 yards of a beachfront event. This rule does not have potential to have 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.  
Attachments: FWS, NMFS, or Wildlife Agency Consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- 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.: If species are present in the area there would be no effect as this proposed rule involves a security zone lasting 12.5 hours that would prohibit entry of persons and vessels within 500 yards of a beachfront event. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from being in the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Sector Los Angeles-Long Beach or a designated representative and will not affect any ESA species.

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.: Marine mammals may be present in the area, but the proposed security zone will only restrict vessel movement and persons from entering the zone.  
Attachments: MMPA consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- 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.: Species are not present in the area and the security zone will only restrict vessels and persons from entering.  
Attachments: BGEPA MBTA consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- What is your Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (essential fish habitat) finding and determination? -- N/A  
Attachments: EFH information: (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?): No floodplains present nor would they be affected by a security zone.
- 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?): Proposed action is located entirely on the Pacific Ocean and no wetlands are present.
- Coastal Barrier Unit -- Coastal Barrier Unit present  
Explain why the proposed action would not significantly impact these resources. : Proposed Security

Zone will not affect any Coastal Barriers as it only restricting vessels and persons from entering the area.

- Coastal Zone Management 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?): Proposed action is a security zone entirely on the water that only restricts vessels and persons and will not affect any Coastal Management Areas.

- Section 10 navigable waterway -- 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?): Proposed action is a security zone that only restricts vessels/persons from entering the area and will not affect any Section 10 Waterways.

- 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?): Proposed action is a security zone entirely on the water and there are no sole source aquifers or wellheads present.

- 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?): No prime farmland present within the proposed security zone on the Pacific Ocean.

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

Explain why the proposed action would not significantly impact these resources. : Proposed Security Zone is offshore from Will Rogers State Beach, Pacific Palisades, CA but the zone will only restrict vessels and persons to remain 500 yards from the beach and will not significantly impact the resource.

- 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. : The Proposed security zone will not result in the potential violation of a Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed to protect the environment as it will only restrict vessels and persons to remain 500 yards from the beach during the duration of an event for one day.

- 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. : The Proposed security zone will not 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 as it is regulatory in nature and temporary lasting only one day.

- 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.: Security zones are regularly used in cases such as this to protect people and infrastructure during high level events and will not 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.

- Will the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future actions that have significant effects? -- No  
Please explain how you came to this determination. : This proposed security zone will not establish a precedent for future actions that have significant effects as it is already a regularly utilized Limited Access Area the Coast Guard uses on a regular basis.

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

Required: Please summarize determination.: This rulemaking is to ensure the security of personnel and the navigable waters within a 500-yard radius of the beachfront event before, during, and after the scheduled event. The size and scope are normal for this type of action.

- 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. : The proposed security zone is intended to ensure the security of personnel and these navigable waters before, during, and after a beachfront event. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the security zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. As such the proposed action will not have the potential to result in the significant degradation of existing poor environmental conditions nor will the Proposed Action initiate a potentially significant environmentally degrading influence, activity, or effect in areas not already significantly modified from their natural condition.

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

Please explain how you came to this determination. : The proposed security zone will be used to only ensure that vessels and persons remain a safe distance from the shore during an event onshore and is not related to other actions with cumulatively significant impacts.

- 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. : The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the security of personnel and the navigable waters within a 500-yard radius of the beachfront event before, during, and after the scheduled event. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the security zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative.
- 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. : This proposed rule involves a security zone lasting 12.5 hours that would prohibit entry within 500 yards of a beachfront event. 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. 1
- 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). : This proposed rule involves a security zone lasting 12.5 hours that would prohibit entry within 500 yards of a beachfront event. This rule does not have potential to have 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.  
Attachments: FWS, NMFS, or Wildlife Agency Consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- 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.: If species are present in the area there would be no effect as this proposed rule involves a security zone lasting 12.5 hours that would prohibit entry of persons and vessels within 500 yards of a beachfront event. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from being in the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Sector Los Angeles-Long Beach or a designated representative and will not affect any ESA species.  
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.: Marine mammals may be present in the area, but the proposed security zone will only restrict vessel movement and persons from entering the zone.  
Attachments: MMPA consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- 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.: Species are not present in the area and the security zone will only restrict vessels and persons from entering.  
Attachments: BGEPA MBTA consultation: (No files uploaded yet.)
- What is your Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (essential fish habitat) finding and determination? -- N/A  
Attachments: EFH information: (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?): No floodplains present nor would they be affected by a security zone.
- 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?): Proposed action is located entirely on the Pacific Ocean and no wetlands are present.
- Coastal Barrier Unit -- Coastal Barrier Unit present  
Explain why the proposed action would not significantly impact these resources. : Proposed Security Zone will not affect any Coastal Barriers as it only restricting vessels and persons from entering the area.
- Coastal Zone Management 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?): Proposed action is a security zone entirely on the water that only restricts vessels and persons and will not affect any Coastal



Management Areas.

- Section 10 navigable waterway -- 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?): Proposed action is a security zone that only restricts vessels/persons from entering the area and will not affect any Section 10 Waterways.
- 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?): Proposed action is a security zone entirely on the water and there are no sole source aquifers or wellheads present.
- 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?): No prime farmland present within the proposed security zone on the Pacific Ocean.
- Designated land (i.e., Wilderness Area, Wild and Scenic River, Marine Sanctuary, National Park, National Monument, National Natural Landmark, Wildlife Refuge, and Wilderness Area -- Designated lands present  
Explain why the proposed action would not significantly impact these resources. : Proposed Security Zone is offshore from Will Rogers State Beach, Pacific Palisades, CA but the zone will only restrict vessels and persons to remain 500 yards from the beach and will not significantly impact the resource.
- 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. : The Proposed security zone will not result in the potential violation of a Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed to protect the environment as it will only restrict vessels and persons to remain 500 yards from the beach during the duration of an event for one day.
- 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. : The Proposed security zone will not 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 as it is regulatory in nature and temporary lasting only one day.
- 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.: Security zones are regularly used in cases such as this to protect people and infrastructure during high level events and will not 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.

- Will the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future actions that have significant effects? -- No  
Please explain how you came to this determination. : This proposed security zone will not establish a precedent for future actions that have significant effects as it is already a regularly utilized Limited Access Area the Coast Guard uses on a regular basis.

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

Required: Please summarize determination.: This rulemaking is to ensure the security of personnel and the navigable waters within a 500-yard radius of the beachfront event before, during, and after the scheduled event. The size and scope are normal for this type of action.

- 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. : The proposed security zone is intended to ensure the security of personnel and these navigable waters before, during, and after a beachfront event. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the security zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. As such the proposed action will not have the potential to result in the significant degradation of existing poor environmental conditions nor will the Proposed Action initiate a potentially significant environmentally degrading influence, activity, or effect in areas not already significantly modified from their natural condition.

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

Please explain how you came to this determination. : The proposed security zone will be used to only ensure that vessels and persons remain a safe distance from the shore during an event onshore and is not related to other actions with cumulatively significant impacts.

- 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 proposed security zone will be entirely on

water, offshore from the Will Rogers State Park Beach and will only serve to prevent vessels and persons from getting within 500 yards of an event being held there.

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 – Oakland Ca</p>
<p>2. Title of Proposed Action: USCG-2024-0607 Security Zone; Santa Monica Bay, Pacific Palisades, CA</p>
<p>3. Identifying Number of Proposed Action: DSS-USCG-2024-19989</p>
<p>4. Estimated Start Date and Useful Life of Proposed Action: Start Date: 08/11/2024 - End Date: 8/11/202</p>
<p>5. Location of Proposed Action: State-/Territory-Wide: California</p>
<p>6. Description of Proposed Action:  The Coast Guard is proposing to establish a temporary security zone for certain waters of Santa Monica Bay. This action is necessary to provide for the security of life on these navigable waters near Will Rogers State Beach, Pacific Palisades, CA, during a beachfront event on August 11, 2024. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from being in the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Sector Los Angeles-Long Beach or a designated representative. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.</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>
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"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A. Will the Proposed Action have a potentially significant effect on public health or safety?                      Yes No                      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>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>K. Is the Proposed Action related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts?</p>
<p>Remarks:</p>	
<p><b>SECTION III - Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) Determination</b></p>	

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: Ronald Sampert	Digitally signed by Ronald Sampert at 07/03/2024 2:30 PM   Ronald Sampert	Date: 07/03/2024
-------------------------	---	---------------------

11b. Environmental Approver of this REC

Name: William Robinson (Level III)	Digitally signed by William Robinson (Level III) at 07/03/2024 2:38 PM   William Robinson (Level III)	Date: 07/03/2024
---------------------------------------	---	---------------------

11c. Action Proponent

Name: Stacey Crecy	Digitally signed by Stacey Crecy at 07/30/2024 4:40 AM  Stacey Crecy	Date: 07/30/2024
-----------------------	---	---------------------

## 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.