

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

**GUAM COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

**ASSESSMENT FORMAT**

DATE OF APPLICATION: 23 September 2021

NAME OF APPLICANT: Jeffrey Lambrecht, Environmental Planner for Naval Base Guam

ADDRESS: Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command Marianas, ATTN: EV Jeff Lambrecht PSC  
455 Box 195, FPO AP 96540-2937

TELEPHONE NO.: (671) 339-2587 Fax No. \_\_\_\_\_ Cell No: \_\_\_\_\_

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Jeffrey.lambrecht@fe.navy.mil

TITLE OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Underwater Electromagnetic Measurement System

10

**COMPLETE FOLLOWING PAGES**

11  
12  
13

FOR BUREAU OF STATISTICS AND PLANS ONLY:

DATE APPLICATION RECEIVED: \_\_\_\_\_

OCRM NOTIFIED: \_\_\_\_\_ LIC. AGENCY NOTIFIED: \_\_\_\_\_

APPLICANT NOTIFIED: \_\_\_\_\_ PUBLIC NOTICE GIVEN: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER AGENCY REVIEW

REQUESTED: \_\_\_\_\_

DETERMINATION:

( ) CONSISTENT ( ) NON-CONSISTENT ( ) FURTHER INFORMATION REQUESTED

OCRM NOTIFIED: \_\_\_\_\_ LIC. AGENCY NOTIFIED: \_\_\_\_\_

APPLICANT NOTIFIED: \_\_\_\_\_

ACTION LOG:

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_

5. \_\_\_\_\_

DATE REVIEW COMPLETED: \_\_\_\_\_

1 **DEVELOPMENT POLICIES (DP):**

2 **DP 1. Shore Area Development**

3 Intent: To ensure environmental and aesthetic compatibility of shore area land uses.

4

5 Policy: Only those uses shall be located within the Seashore Reserve which:

6 - enhance, are compatible with or do not generally detract from the surrounding  
7 coastal area's aesthetic and environmental quality and beach accessibility; or

8 - can demonstrate dependence on such a location and the lack of feasible  
9 alternative sites.

10

11 Discussion: DP 1 is not applicable. The project is not located within Guam's Seashore Reserve.

12

13 **DP 2. Urban Development**

14

15 Intent: To cluster high impact uses such that coherent community design, function,  
16 infrastructure support and environmental compatibility are assured.

17

18 Policy: Commercial, multi-family, industrial and resort-hotel zone uses and uses requiring  
19 high levels of support facilities shall be concentrated within appropriate zone as  
20 outlined on the Guam Zoning Code.

21

22 Discussion: DP 2 is not applicable. The project does not involve introduction of high impact uses such  
23 as commercial, multi-family residential, or resort-hotel uses. After construction, operation of the  
24 UEMMS would include passive acquisition of electromagnetic measurement data with minimal  
25 supporting activities.

26

27 **DP 3. Rural Development**

28 Intent: To provide a development pattern compatible with environmental and infrastructure  
29 support suitability and which can permit traditional lifestyle patterns to continue to  
30 the extent practicable.

31

32 Policy: Rural districts shall be designated in which only low density residential and agricultural  
33 uses will be acceptable. Minimum lot size for these uses should be one-half acre until  
34 adequate infrastructure including functional sewerage is provided.

35

36 Discussion: DP 3 is not applicable. The project does not involve new development in a rural district and  
37 does not involve residential or other new urban development.

1 **DP 4. Major Facility Siting**

2 Intent: To include the national interest in analyzing the siting proposals for major  
3 utilities, fuel and transport facilities.

4  
5 Policy: In evaluating the consistency of proposed major facilities with the goals, policies,  
6 and standards of the Comprehensive Development and Coastal Management Plans,  
7 Guam shall recognize the national interest in the siting of such facilities, including  
8 those associated with electric power production and transmission, petroleum  
9 refining and transmission, port and air installations, solid waste disposal, sewage  
10 treatment, and major reservoir sites.

11  
12 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with DP 4. The project does not involve major new  
13 utility, fuel, or transportation facilities. It supports the national interest by installing equipment that  
14 would improve the Department of Defense’s (DoD) efficiency and effectiveness in protecting U.S. Navy  
15 ships and submarines from detection and threats by hostile forces.

16  
17 **DP 5. Hazardous Areas**

18 Intent: Development in hazardous areas will be governed by the degree of hazard and the  
19 land use regulations.

20  
21 Policy: Identified hazardous lands, including flood plains, erosion-prone areas, air  
22 installations’ crash and sound zones and major fault lines shall be developed only to  
23 the extent that such development does not pose unreasonable risks to the health,  
24 safety or welfare of the people of Guam, and complies with the land use regulations.

25  
26 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with DP 5. The project will continue existing land and  
27 water uses and not involve new development in hazardous areas. Based on Flood Insurance Rate Maps  
28 for the area, the proposed UEMMS would be partially located in Zone A Special Flood Hazard Areas  
29 Subject to Inundation by the 1% Annual Chance Flood, No Base Flood Elevations determined.  
30 However, all of the landside infrastructure would be located either below grade or within existing  
31 structures and would not affect the existing floodplain area or function. The in-water components  
32 would be either below the seafloor or have a minimal profile (e.g., sensor array, CTD sensor, and  
33 subsea cables). The cable shore landing area on Polaris Point would be excavated and generally  
34 returned to pre-construction conditions; no changes in ground elevations or grade are proposed or  
35 anticipated. No development would occur in erosion-prone areas or air installations’ crash and noise  
36 zones and the project would not pose unreasonable risks to the health, safety, or welfare of the  
37 people of Guam.

38  
39 **DP 6. Housing**

40 Intent: To promote efficient community design placed where the resources can  
41 support it.

42  
43 Policy: The government shall encourage efficient design of residential areas, restrict such  
44 development in areas highly susceptible to natural and manmade hazards, and

1 recognize the limitations of the island's resources to support historical patterns of  
2 residential development.

3  
4 Discussion: DP 6 is not applicable. The project does not involve residential development.  
5

6 **DP 7. Transportation**

7 Intent: To provide transportation systems while protecting potentially impacted  
8 resources.

9  
10 Policy: Guam shall develop an efficient and safe transportation system, while limiting  
11 adverse environmental impacts on primary aquifers, beaches, estuaries, coral reefs  
12 and other coastal resources.

13  
14 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with DP 7. The project does not involve the  
15 construction of new public roadways or other transportation systems. The UEMMS sensor array and  
16 related in-water infrastructure would be placed at depths that would not impact navigation in Apra  
17 Harbor. Landside improvements associated with the UEMMS would be located below grade or within  
18 existing structures and would not increase stormwater runoff into adjacent coastal resources. Best  
19 management practices (BMPs) would avoid or minimize potential construction period contaminants  
20 from being transported from the terrestrial project area to receiving waters and coastal resources. The  
21 CDF sites are contained within earthen berms and stormwater runoff is properly managed to avoid  
22 sediment or pollutant transport offsite. During the operational period, there would be little to no  
23 potential for the UEMMS components to adversely affect wetland areas, as the terrestrial cables  
24 would be contained below grade or within existing structures.  
25

26 **DP 8. Erosion and Siltation**

27 Intent: To control development where erosion and siltation damage is likely to occur.  
28

29 Policy: Development shall be limited in areas of 15% or greater slope by requiring strict  
30 compliance with erosion, sedimentation, and land use regulations, as well as other  
31 related land use guidelines for such areas.  
32

33 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with DP 8. The project would employ BMPs and a Storm  
34 Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be developed by the installation contractor to reduce  
35 on-site erosion and off-site sedimentation. The project would comply with permit conditions of its  
36 required NPDES permit and Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 Water Quality Certification permit to  
37 avoid or minimize erosion and sedimentation resulting from construction activities. The contractor  
38 would prepare and adhere to an erosion control plan and install temporary erosion control features  
39 such as silt barriers around landside contractor work zones involving ground disturbance to prevent  
40 construction-related sediments and debris from entering marine waters and storm drains.  
41  
42  
43

1 **RESOURCES POLICIES (RP):**

2 **RP 1. Air Quality**

3 Intent: To control activities to insure good air quality.

4  
5 Policy: All activities and uses shall comply with all local air pollution regulations and all  
6 appropriate Federal air quality standards in order to ensure the maintenance of  
7 Guam's relatively high air quality.

8  
9 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with RP 1. The project would not introduce major new  
10 air emissions sources or stationary air emissions sources and the proposed activity would comply with  
11 applicable air pollution regulations and air quality standards. Short-term, temporarily-emitted air  
12 emissions (e.g., fugitive dust, combustion of fossil fuels) would be generated during the construction  
13 period. BMPs would be implemented to minimize fugitive dust during construction. Example BMPs  
14 include using wind screens, keeping adjacent paved roads clean, covering of open-bodied trucks,  
15 limiting the area that is disturbed at any given time and/or mulching or chemically stabilizing inactive  
16 areas that have been worked.

17  
18 During the operational period, use of the sensor array would not increase ship traffic from either  
19 homeported or transient vessels at NBG. Operation of the UEMMS would not increase the movements  
20 to or from Apra Harbor of NBG homeported vessels and would not generate demand for field  
21 signature measurement of transient vessels. Operation of the UEMMS is not expected to effect on-  
22 base or on-island staffing levels and traffic because current NBG staff would assume the role of  
23 collecting its data.

24  
25 The proposed project is located within a nonattainment area for sulfur dioxide. Total construction  
26 sulfur dioxide emissions are expected to be below de minimis thresholds for Clean Air Act general  
27 conformity, and the project would not trigger a general conformity determination under Section  
28 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. The Navy prepared a Record of Non-Applicability for Clean Air Act  
29 Conformity.

30  
31 **RP 2. Water Quality**

32 Intent: To control activities that may degrade Guam's drinking, recreational, and  
33 ecologically sensitive waters.

34  
35 Policy: Safe drinking water shall be assured and aquatic recreation sites shall be  
36 protected through the regulation of uses and discharges that pose a pollution  
37 threat to Guam's waters, particularly in estuaries, reef and aquifer areas.

38  
39 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with RP 2. The project area is not located over a  
40 drinking water source and would have no impact on Guam's drinking water. In-water construction  
41 activities would require a Clean Water Act Section 404/Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 permit from  
42 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and would comply with the conditions of these permits. Construction  
43 period BMPs would be employed and a SWPPP will be developed by the construction contractor to  
44 reduce on-site erosion and off-site sedimentation into receiving waters that may be ecologically

1 sensitive or support recreation. For example, silt containment devices would installed immediately  
 2 adjacent to and around the dredge barge, around the cable excavation area at Polaris Point, and along  
 3 the shoreline at Polaris Point. No in-water construction would occur during the spawning period for  
 4 both hard (scleractinian) and soft (octocorallia) corals and a rigorous water quality monitoring plan  
 5 would be implemented to continuously monitor and adaptively manage turbidity levels resulting from  
 6 the project’s in-water work. During terrestrial construction activities, the construction contractor  
 7 would prepare and adhere to an erosion control plan and install temporary erosion control features  
 8 such as silt barriers around landside contractor work zones involving ground disturbance to prevent  
 9 construction-related sediments and debris from entering marine waters and storm drains. Fueling of  
 10 construction vehicles and equipment at least 50 feet away from water and within a containment area.  
 11 Complying with the NPDES permit and CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification conditions will  
 12 also avoid or minimize pollution risks to nearby recreational and ecologically sensitive areas.  
 13

14 **RP 3. Fragile Areas**

15 Intent: To protect significant cultural areas, and natural marine and terrestrial wildlife and  
 16 plant habitats.  
 17

18 Policy: Development in the following types of fragile areas including Guam’s Marine  
 19 Protected Areas (MPA) shall be regulated to protect their unique character.  
 20

- 21 - historical and archeological sites
- 22 - wildlife habitats
- 23 - pristine marine and terrestrial communities
- 24 - limestone forests
- 25 - mangrove stands and other wetlands
- 26 - coral reefs

27  
 28 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with RP3 to the maximum extent practicable with the  
 29 implementation of BMPs and proposed impact avoidance, minimization, and offset measures, including  
 30 those identified in the project’s ESA Section 7 and Essential Fish Habitat consultations (see Enclosure 3  
 31 for correspondence). Specific fragile areas identified in RP 3 are addressed in the subsections below.  
 32

33 **Historical and Archaeological Sites.** The project would have no impacts to cultural resources during  
 34 project construction or operation. No archaeological resources, historic architectural resources, or  
 35 traditional cultural properties exist in the project area, including the construction staging area. In  
 36 accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Navy consulted with  
 37 the Guam Historic Preservation Officer regarding the undertaking. In consideration of the information  
 38 on terrestrial and underwater archaeology and the built environment, DON determined that there  
 39 would be no historic properties affected by the Proposed Action under NHPA Section 106. By letter  
 40 dated July 5, 2019, the Guam Historic Preservation Officer concurred with the Navy’s determination

1 (see correspondence in Enclosure 3).  
2

3 **Terrestrial Wildlife Habitats (including pristine terrestrial communities and limestone forests).** No  
4 development is proposed in terrestrial project area in pristine terrestrial wildlife habitats or limestone  
5 forest areas. Minor and temporary impacts to terrestrial vegetation would occur from land-based  
6 construction activities. Project construction activities would occur in locations that have been  
7 previously disturbed and do not include limestone forest. The project would not impact any federal- or  
8 Guam-listed endangered plant because there are no protected terrestrial vegetation species known to  
9 occur in the project area or surrounding areas.

10  
11 Minor and temporary impacts to terrestrial wildlife may occur from land-based construction activities.  
12 Minimal areas of vegetation may be cleared during construction, and noise and human activity would  
13 increase during construction. Because construction activities are expected to occur during normal  
14 daytime work hours, additional lighting is not anticipated. The project would not have a significant  
15 impact on terrestrial wildlife because there is no native terrestrial wildlife in the project area. No  
16 impacts would occur to any federal- or Guam-listed threatened or endangered animal, birds protected  
17 under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and Guam-designated species of greatest conservation need. No  
18 foraging, nesting, or roosting sites for protected animals were identified in the project area. Pondered  
19 water, which could attract migrating birds, is not anticipated to occur in the CDFs. If the CDF becomes  
20 an attractive site for migrating birds, installation land managers and construction contractors would  
21 discourage use of the sites by migratory birds through various means, such as deploying decoys and  
22 using noise makers. Because UEMMS terrestrial operations would consist of data transmission and  
23 acquisition that occur below grade or within existing structures, operational period impacts to  
24 terrestrial wildlife habitats are not anticipated.

25 **Marine Wildlife Habitats (including pristine marine communities and coral reefs).** The project area  
26 includes three sites within Outer Apra Harbor: sensor array site, subsea cable route, and cable shore  
27 landing at Polaris Point. The project would directly impact approximately 16,000 square feet (sq ft) of  
28 benthic substrate in Outer Apra Harbor, including impacts to corals and soft-sediment infauna. Indirect  
29 impacts from in-water construction activity are presumed in the marine waters adjacent to and up to an  
30 approximately 410-foot (ft) radius of the in-water work. During the operational period, project-related  
31 activities (e.g., maintenance and repair) would be minimal and infrequent due to the passive nature of  
32 UEMMS operations, resulting in less than significant impacts to coral.

33  
34 There is no designated critical habitat in Apra Harbor, including the project area. Only three ESA-listed  
35 species (green sea turtle [*Chelonia mydas*], hawksbill sea turtle [*Eretmochelys imbricata*], and scalloped  
36 hammerhead shark [*Sphyrna lewini*]) have reasonable potential to occur where most of the Proposed  
37 Action would occur. No ESA-listed coral species (e.g., *Acropora globiceps*) were observed within the  
38 project area. Based on the anticipated low occurrence of ESA-listed species within the project area, the  
39 Navy determined that project has the potential to affect, but is not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed  
40 species, as such adverse effects have been determined either insignificant or discountable. See  
41 Enclosure 2 for correspondence.

42  
43 A 2020 marine survey of the project area found that substantial healthy coral communities fall within  
44 the UEMMS footprint, with high percent coral cover occurring in a majority of the direct impact area.  
45 The survey and photogrammetric orthomosaics image analysis found that the overall dominant biotic

1 cover comprises hard substrate, with coral, algae (macro & cyanobacteria), other fauna (sponge, sessile  
2 invertebrates, etc.), and sand or silt substrate cover varying by location (i.e., direct vs. indirect impact  
3 area). In the direct impact area, 33 species of fish were documented. Two turtles (one green and one  
4 hawksbill turtle) were observed surfacing in or near the direct impacts area on separate occasions  
5 during the 2020 survey.

6  
7 The subsea cable route contains fine, unconsolidated sediments along the majority of the route in  
8 water depths greater than 59 ft. At the seaward end of the cable corridor (subsea slope immediately  
9 east of the array), coral habitat was similar to that found within the UEMMS array footprint. There is  
10 low coral abundance at depths of 45 ft along the cable route. Sponges and macroalgae were present in  
11 limited locations along the cable route, but the shore approach was entirely sand and rubble. The  
12 Polaris Point shore landing survey area crossed the steep slope to the shore, and comprised a  
13 predominantly disturbed sand and coral rubble substrate with low coral abundance.

14  
15 The project would result in the physical removal of 7,680 coral communities (7,535 in the sensor array  
16 footprint and 145 in the cable shore landing footprint) and increased suspended sediments that would  
17 adversely impacts corals in and adjacent to the project area during the construction period. The  
18 following environmental stressors on coral in the project area unlikely to occur due to project  
19 construction: wastes and discharges, aquatic invasive species, chemical contaminants, hypoxia, and  
20 unexploded ordnance (UXO). The implementation of avoidance, minimization, and offset actions would  
21 result in less than significant impacts to these coral communities (see Enclosure 3 for details).  
22 Avoidance measures include establishing a subsea cable route that avoids corals and utilizing diver-  
23 guided cable installation to avoid sensitive benthic resources. Minimization measures include revising  
24 the project design to reduce the excavation area needed to install the sensor array; relocating the CTD  
25 sensor closer to the array to reduce impacts to coral resources; selecting a subsea cable attachment  
26 method that has fewer impacts to benthic communities; and translocating about 6,300 corals and  
27 maintaining and monitoring the translocated corals. Measures to offset temporary losses of biological  
28 services include habitat restoration and conservation of 35,240 sq ft at Mound 9 (24,590 sq ft to offset  
29 coral cover loss and 10,650 sq ft to offset EFH loss).

30  
31 **Mangrove Stands and Other Wetlands.** There are no mangrove stands or delineated wetlands within  
32 the project area or CDF sites. Aside from the excavation activities related to the sensor cable shore  
33 landing on Polaris Point, there would be no subsurface work. Adherence to the project's NPDES permit  
34 conditions, BMPs, and provisions of its forthcoming SWPPP would avoid or minimize potential  
35 contaminants from being transported from the terrestrial project area on Polaris Point to the nearest  
36 wetlands, an approximately 4-acre mangrove wetland about 1,300 feet east of the proposed  
37 construction staging area. The CDF sites are contained within earthen berms and stormwater runoff is  
38 properly managed to avoid sediment or pollutant transport offsite.

39  
40 **Coral Reefs.** See discussion above under RP 3 "Marine Wildlife Habitats."

41  
42 **RP 4. Living Marine Resources**

43 Intent: To protect marine resources in Guam's waters.

44  
45 Policy: All living resources within the waters of Guam, particularly fish, shall be protected  
46 from over harvesting and, in the case of corals, sea turtles and marine mammals,



1 from any taking whatsoever.  
2

3 Discussion: The project is consistent with RP 4. The ESA Section 7 and Essential Fish Habitat consultation  
4 materials (Enclosure 2) provide analyses of impacts on fish, corals, sea turtles, and marine mammals,  
5 including avoidance, minimization, and offset actions to protect marine resources in Guam’s waters.  
6

7 **Essential Fish Habitat.** The project has the potential to affect EFH through physical removal (likely),  
8 increased suspended sediments (likely), elevated underwater noise levels (unlikely), wastes and  
9 discharges (unlikely), aquatic invasive species (unlikely), chemical contaminants (unlikely), hypoxia  
10 (unlikely), and UXO (unlikely). With the implementation of avoidance and minimization measures, the  
11 impacts would be temporary and indirect in all cases except the physical removal of marine  
12 invertebrate community. The Navy conducted EFH consultation with NOAA Fisheries and determined  
13 that the project would reduce the quantity and quality of EFH, and accordingly would adversely affect  
14 EFH for Bottomfish and Seamount Groundfish Management Unit Species and Pelagic Management Unit  
15 Species within Apra Harbor (see Enclosure 3 for consultation correspondence). The indirect adverse  
16 effects to EFH from project-related degradation of water quality would be minimized through  
17 implementation of appropriate silt-containment BMPs. Unavoidable loss of ecosystem function and  
18 services that support Management Unit Species would be minimized through implementation of the  
19 proposed coral transplantation plan. Due to the containment of impacts to Apra Harbor, the quantity  
20 and quality of the EFH within the harbor, the size and scale of the impacts, implementation of  
21 temporary and permanent avoidance and minimization measures built into the project and  
22 compensatory mitigation for unavoidable loss (i.e., coral translocation and habitat conversion of 10,650  
23 sq ft at Mound 9), the Navy determined that the anticipated impacts do not have the potential to cause  
24 substantial adverse effects to EFH.  
25

26 During the operational period, the project would have less than significant impacts on EFH in Apra  
27 Harbor. Operation of the UEMMS would not involve additional structural changes to the benthic  
28 habitat, increased sediment resuspension, elevated noise levels, additional waste, discharge, or  
29 chemical contaminants, exposure to aquatic invasive species, hypoxia, or UXO.  
30

31 By letter dated July 21, 2021, NMFS agreed with the Navy’s EFH determination that the Proposed  
32 Action would adversely affect EFH and result in unavoidable loss (see Enclosure 3) and agreed that the  
33 Navy’s proposed mitigation that includes avoidance (BMPs), minimization through the translocation of  
34 corals, and offset via the creation of new habitat area, is a viable approach to conserving EFH. In its July  
35 2021 letter, NMFS also proposed conservation measures to ensure that adverse effects to EFH are  
36 avoided, minimized, offset for, or otherwise mitigated. A summary of these conservation measures and  
37 the Navy’s corresponding response follow (see Enclosure 3 for the full text of the Navy’s response  
38 letter, dated August 18, 2021).  
39

40 Conservation Recommendation 1: To ensure that the proposed offset from the HEA is effective, the  
41 Navy should develop a plan for implementation that would quantify coral recruitment and growth over  
42 time (i.e., out years) at Mound 9. The Navy should consider coordinating this monitoring plan with  
43 actions listed in the 2019 JRM INRMP and consider including Mound 9 surveys in the next INRMP  
44 update.

45 *Discussion: The Navy will develop a two-year monitoring and maintenance plan consistent with the five-*  
46 *year adjacent monitoring for the Lima, Mike, and November Wharves translocation project at Mound 9.*

1 *The Navy agrees that the monitoring plan for all Mound 9 projects should consider aligning with the*  
2 *2019 JRM INRMP, and will consider including funding to support long-term monitoring events at Mound*  
3 *9 within the next update to the JRM INRMP.*

4 Conservation Recommendation 2: The Navy should ensure that in-water construction and mitigation  
5 activities avoid any unnecessary contact with marine organisms by divers and/or materials, and that  
6 divers also avoid exposing corals directly or indirectly to toxicopathological agents.

7 *Discussion: The Navy agrees with this Conservation Recommendation and will ensure that the*  
8 *appropriate BMPs are implemented during coral translocation, benthic surveys, boulder deployment,*  
9 *benthic stabilization activities, sensor installation, and cable deployment and anchoring activities to*  
10 *avoid unnecessary contact with marine organisms. To the best of their ability, all divers will avoid*  
11 *exposing corals directly or indirectly to toxicopathological agents.*

12 Conservation Recommendation 3: To ensure that the translocation of coral colonies from the *Porites*  
13 *rus* complex (>80% of corals in the action area) is meeting early survivorship targets, the Navy should  
14 provide NMFS a monitoring report after each monitoring event.

15 *Discussion: The Navy agrees with this Conservation Recommendation and will ensure that subject*  
16 *monitoring reports will be provided to NMFS upon completion of the coral translocation and after both*  
17 *subsequent monitoring events (at 12 and 24 months). The Navy agrees to coordinate with NMFS if the*  
18 *rate of survival does not meet the 70% survivorship target after the final monitoring period.*

19  
20 **RP 5. Visual Quality**

21 Intent: To protect the quality of Guam's natural scenic beauty

22  
23 Policy: Preservation and enhancement of, and respect for the island's scenic resources shall  
24 be encouraged through increased enforcement of and compliance with sign, litter,  
25 zoning, subdivision, building and related land-use laws. Visually objectionable uses  
26 shall be located to the maximum extent practicable so as not to degrade significant  
27 views from scenic overlooks, highways and trails.

28  
29 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with RP 5. All the project components would be located  
30 under water, below grade (onshore), or within existing facilities and would not affect existing scenic  
31 resources. Onshore disposal of excavated material resulting from project construction would occur in  
32 existing permitted facilities (Orote Airfield CDF or Field 5 CDF), which are generally screened from  
33 public view points by vegetation.

34  
35  
36 **RP6. Recreation Areas**

37 Intent: To encourage environmentally compatible recreational development.

38  
39 Policy: The Government of Guam shall encourage development of varied types of  
40 recreational facilities located and maintained so as to be compatible with the  
41 surrounding environment and land uses, adequately serve community centers and  
42 urban areas and protect beaches and such passive recreational areas as wildlife,

1 marine conservation and marine protected areas, scenic overlooks, parks, and  
2 historical sites.

3  
4 Developments, activities and uses shall comply with the Guam Recreational  
5 Water Use Management Plan (RWUMP).  
6

7 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with RP 6. The project does not involve development of  
8 recreational facilities. It would not impede or otherwise affect Guam’s existing recreational areas or  
9 facilities.  
10

11 **RP 7. Public Access**

12 Intent: To ensure the right of public access.  
13

14 Policy: The public's right of unrestricted access shall be ensured to all non-federally owned  
15 beach areas and all Guam recreation areas, parks, scenic overlooks, designated  
16 conservation areas and their public lands. Agreements shall be encouraged with the  
17 owners of private and federal property for the provision of releasable access to and  
18 use of resources of public nature located on such land.  
19

20 Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with RP 7. The terrestrial project area is located within  
21 existing Navy-controlled land, which does not provide access to Guam’s public recreation areas. While  
22 recreational vessels may traverse the waters near the sensor array construction area, construction  
23 activities would not restrict public access to public beaches or other recreation areas. During the  
24 operational period, all of the UEMMS components would either be secured to the seafloor at depths  
25 that would not affect navigation, or located below grade or within existing facilities at Polaris Point.  
26  
27

28 **RP 8. Agricultural Lands**

29 Intent: To stop urban types of development on agricultural land.  
30

31 Policy: Critical agricultural land shall be preserved and maintained for agricultural use.  
32

33 Discussion:  
34 RP 8 is not applicable. The project is not located on agricultural lands.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**FEDERAL CONSISTENCY**

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FORM**

Date: 23 September 2021

Project/Activity Title or Description: Underwater Electromagnetic Measurement System

Location: Piti, Guam

Other applicable area(s) affected, if appropriate: \_\_\_\_\_

Est. Start Date: May 2022 Est. Duration: 10 months

**APPLICANT**

Name & Title: Jeffrey Lambrecht, Environmental Planner

Agency/Organization: Department of the Navy, Joint Region Marianas

Address: PSC 455, Box 195, FPO AP

Zip Code 96540-2937

Telephone No. during business hours:

A/C ( 671 ) 339-2587

A/C ( \_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_

Fax ( \_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

**AGENT**

Name & Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Agency/Organization Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Zip Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone No. during business hours:

A/C ( \_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_

A/C ( \_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_

Fax ( \_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

1 **CATEGORY OF APPLICATION** (check one only)

- 2
- 3  I - Federal Agency Activity
- 4  II - Federal Permit or License
- 5  III - Federal Grants & Assistance

6 **TYPE OF STATEMENT** (check one only) (x)

- 7  Consistency
- 8  General Consistency (Category I only)
- 9  Negative Determination (Category I only) ( )
- 10  Non-Consistency (Category I only)

11

12 **APPROVING FEDERAL AGENCY** (Categories II & III only)

13

14 Agency \_\_\_\_\_

15 Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_

16 Telephone No. during business hours:

17 Area Code ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

18 Area Code ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

19

20 **FEDERAL AUTHORITY FOR ACTIVITY**

21 Title of Law Title 10 – Armed Forces, United States Code

22 Section Subtitle A – General Military Law, Part IV Service, Supply, and Procurement

23

24 **OTHER GUAM APPROVALS REQUIRED:**

Agency	Type of Approval	Date of Application	Status
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service	Completion of Essential Fish Habitat Consultation	June 15, 2021	Consultation completed Aug. 18, 2021
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service	Completion of Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 Consultation	Consultation initiated	Reference concurrence letter when available
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Clean Water Act 401 Water Quality Certification	Pending	Pending submittal of applications
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Section 10 Rivers and Harbors Act permit	Pending	Pending submittal of applications
State Historical Preservation Office	Section 106 concurrence	June 12, 2019	Consultation completed July 5, 2019

25

26

27