

U.S. COAST GUARD
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DETERMINATION
FOR
LIFERAFT SERVICING INTERVALS

46 CFR Parts 28, 122, 109, 131, 160, 185, and 199

4526-01-1118-5

This proposed rule would amend certain vessel regulations to provide consistency in the requirements for servicing of inflatable liferafts and inflatable buoyant apparatus (IBA). It would defer the first servicing of a new liferaft or IBA to two years after initial packing on all vessels not certificated under SOLAS.

This action has been thoroughly reviewed by the Coast Guard, and it has been determined by the undersigned to be categorically excluded under current Coast Guard CE #34(d) from further environmental documentation, in accordance with Section 2.B.2. and Figure 2-1 of the NEPA Implementing Procedures, COMDTINST M16475.1D, since implementation of this action will not result in any:

1. Significant cumulative impacts on the human environment;
2. Substantial controversy or substantial change to existing environmental conditions;
3. Impacts which are more than minimal on properties protected under 4(f) of the DOT Act, as superseded by Public Law 97-449 and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; or

4. Inconsistencies with any Federal, State, or local laws or administrative determinations relating to the environment.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <u>11 Feb 02</u> Date | <u>David Houser</u> Preparer | David L. Houser Chief, Standards Evaluation and Analysis Division |
| <u>20 Feb 02</u> Date | <u>Edward J. Wandelt</u> Environmental Reviewer | Ed Wandelt Chief, Environmental Management Division |
| <u>21 Feb. 2002</u> Date | <u>Paul J. Pluta</u> Responsible Official | Paul J. Pluta, RADM Assistant Commandant, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection |

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

NOTE: This checklist should be completed by the decision-maker in consultation with an **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SPECIALIST**. Please read the information on how to properly complete this checklist on pages 4-10 and make sure each question is answered using the accompanying explanations found on the pages cited after each question. Attempting to answer these questions without reading the accompanying explanations may result in an incorrect or incomplete environmental analysis.

***Project Description:**

This proposed rule would amend certain vessel regulations to provide consistency in the requirements for servicing of inflatable liferafts and inflatable buoyant apparatus (IBA). It would defer the first servicing of a new liferaft or IBA to two years after initial packing on all vessels not certificated under SOLAS.

Activity Year: 2002

(*Note: Checklist preparer may want to attach additional descriptive information on the proposed action such as: diagrams, site maps, and photographs.)

Part I. Checklist Analysis.**YES NO NEED
DATA**

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Is there likely to be a significant effect on public health or safety? (p. 5) | | X | |
| 2. Does the proposed action occur on or near a unique characteristic of the geographic area, such as a historic or cultural resource, park land, prime farmland, wetland, wild and scenic river, ecologically critical area, or property requiring special consideration under 49 U.S.C. 303(c)? (p. 5-6) | | X | |
| 3. Is there a potential for effects on the quality of the environment that are likely to be highly controversial in terms of scientific validity or public opinion? (p. 7) | | X | |
| 4. Is there a potential for effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks? (p. 7) | | X | |
| 5. Will the action set a precedent for future actions with significant effects or a decision in principle about a future consideration? (p. 7) | | X | |
| 6. Are the action's impacts individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant when considered along with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions? (p. 7-8) | | X | |
| 7. Is the proposed action likely to have a significant impact on a district, site, highway, structure, or object that is listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or to cause the loss or destruction of a significant scientific, cultural, or historic resource? (p.8) | | X | |
| 8. Will the proposed action have a significant effect on species or habitats protected by the Endangered Species Act? (p. 9) | | X | |
| 9. Is there a potential or threatened violation of a Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (p. 9-10) | | X | |
| 10. Is the action likely to have other significant effects on public health and safety or on any other environmental media or resources that are not specifically identified in this checklist? (p. 10) | | X | |

Part II. Comments or Additional Information Related to Part I:

Part II. Comments or Additional Information Related to Part I (continued):

Part III. Conclusions.

1. A CE is recommended for this proposed action. [X]
Comments: Since this Coast Guard action falls under #34 (d) of the Coast Guard's NEPA Implementing Procedures and Policy for Considering Environmental Impacts, COMDTINST M16475.1D, a CE meets this criteria.

2. An EA is recommended for this proposed action. []
Comments: _____

3. An EIS is recommended for this proposed action. []
Comments: _____

01/15/2002
Date Bradley K. McKittrick
*Preparer/Environmental Project Manager

Bradley K. McKittrick
Economist, Standards
Evaluation and
Analysis Division

20 Feb 02
Date Ed Wandelt
**Environmental Reviewer

Ed Wandelt
Chief, Environmental
Management Division

*The USCG preparer signs for EIS's prepared in-house. The USCG environmental project manager signs for EIS's prepared by an applicant, a contractor, or another outside party.
**Signature of the Environmental Reviewer for the Bridge Administration Program may be that of the preparer's.