AGENCY INFORMATION

Agency: Department of Homeland Security

Name of Agency CERPO: Dr Teresa Pohlman

Email address of Agency CERPO: teresa.pohlman@hq.dhs.gov

Agency submitter (if different from agency CERPO):

Submitter email address:

*If this form is submitted by a Permitting Council member's designee, please provide a delegation memo with the self-assessment submission.

SECTION 1. EXAMPLES OF BP IMPLEMENTATION

While FPISC OED does not require an implementation narrative for each BP category, it encourages each member agency to highlight its successes and challenges for each category. This can be in the form of identifying positive outcomes from implementation of a BP during FY 2020 or from identifying where a BP did not prevent the issue it was intended to prevent and how the agency or Permitting Council may want to consider addressing that. The specific BPs to be reported on are listed in Table 1 of the Fiscal Year 2020 Recommended Best Practices for Environmental Reviews and Authorizations for Infrastructure Projects and in Appendix B. Please note, BP Categories and BPs have been shortened in the dropdowns for ease of use.

Agencies are also encouraged to identify and submit "alternative BPs" that reflect where the agencies have implemented process improvements that meet the statutory BP categories but not one of the specific BPs identified in the FY 2020 BP Report. Alternative BPs should be submitted to FPISC OED by August 28, 2020 for approval before submitting the BP through this form. If your alternative BP has been approved, please choose "Alternative BP" from the "Corresponding BP" drop-down menu below for the appropriate entry.

Please adhere to a word count limit of 200 words per BP example in this section (i.e., if you provide examples of implementation of four BPs, please use four template boxes below for a total word count of 800 words), while thoroughly reflecting your accomplishments and challenges. Provide links and/or citations as appropriate, and provide as many relevant examples as possible. If you would like to provide more than four examples of BP implementation, please contact FPISC OED for a supplemental form.

Best Practice Category: (vi) GIS and other tools	Corresponding BP: vi.1 Knowledge sharing about
DHS currently operates an environmental planning and historic preservation decision support system (EPHP DSS) which is mandated by policy for internal use by Components. The EPHP DSS is a web-based system designed to standardize and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of reviews of proposed actions for compliance with NEPA requirements. The EPHP DSS also enables knowledge sharing across DHS regarding environmental planning activities and requirements, stores DHS NEPA documents, and is used to gather information necessary for meeting internal and external reporting requirements. The Department is currently modifying the EPHP DSS to include preliminary tracking data on FAST-41 and	

Best Practice Category: (iv) Increasing transparency	Corresponding BP: iv.1 Share information about
DHS will finalize an environmental permitting guidance document for Components in 2020 and plans to provide an accompanying online training course in the next 12-18 months. Additionally, DHS is updating the NEPA page of its public website and has included information relevant to FAST-41 and EO 13807.	

Best Practice Category: (i) Early stakeholder engagem	Corresponding BP: i.1 Early stakeholder engagem
The Department of Homeland Security (Department or DHS) is committed to complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. As the lead federal agency for the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad bridge project in Bismarck, ND, the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) hosted a virtual consultation meeting with interested stakeholders in September 2020. Because of COVID19, an in-person consultation meeting was not feasible. Thirty-five individuals attended the meeting. Fewer people (around 20) attended previous in-person meetings due to funding restrictions associated with travel. The USCG utilized ACHP to facilitate the meeting and to host the IT platform, which also	

Best Practice Category: (ii) Timely decisions for ERA (	Corresponding BP: ii.1 ERA process templates/ c
In FY20, the USCG developed a detailed DEIS timeline (for use when the USCG is the lead agency) to ensure all aspects of FAST-41 and MIP are completed in concert with the posted Dashboard and internal agency-specific milestones. The USCG shares this timeline with project sponsors/applicants. In FY20, the USCG began developing one-page briefing sheets for all Dashboard projects, and all potentially high-level, non-Dashboard projects. The one-pagers are used to outline major issues to better align HQ with District Bridge Offices, USCG HQ with DHS, and USCG with project	

SECTION 2. FAST-41 PROJECT SPECIFIC PERMITTING IMPROVEMENTS/OUTCOMES

This section should highlight examples from specific projects. Please include agency innovations, initiatives, successes, and identification of and resolution to challenges. Agencies are encouraged to report on FPISC OED recommendations from the FY 2019 ARC (See OED Assessment, Part 2).

Please adhere to a total word count limit of 300 words for this section, while thoroughly reflecting your accomplishments and challenges. Provide links and/or citations as appropriate. Provide as many relevant examples as possible in the space provided below.

The USCG had Dashboard milestones for one FAST-41 project, Alaska LNG. The USCG has a very small District Bridge Office in AK, manned by two FTE. Due to the retirement of the district project manager in FY20, the USCG instituted a new protocol with the applicant to ensure both the USCG HQ and District Bridge Office were included in all correspondence regarding the project. This ensured that the project milestones were met, including the Bridge Permit decisions in September 2020 - one week prior to the targeted milestone. Another challenge was the discovery of how dependencies affected USCG permitting milestones. As examples, the USACE Section 404 permit was required to be issued, and the applicant's rights-of-way were required to be resolved prior to USCG Bridge Permit issuance. The dependencies were not reconciled on the Dashboard. Resolutions could only be accomplished through thorough and frequent coordination between USCG HQ, the USCG District Bridge Office, FERC, resource agencies, the applicant, and FPISC.

SECTION 3. PERMITTING PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS (GENERAL)

Please document activities undertaken by the agency in FY 2020 that may be outside the information captured in the two sections above. Examples include challenges addressed or looking to be addressed through actions like: new tracking systems, procedural changes, outreach efforts/information gathering, regulatory changes, and interagency discussions/working groups/agreements/collaboration through the Permitting Council and with other Permitting Council member agencies. This section provides a space to report any new and unexpected challenges with novel solutions developed by agencies. Addressing challenges that were anticipated, then addressed by existing or new BPs can be included in sections 1 and 2.

Please provide a narrative for each process improvement in a separate section below. Please adhere to a total word count limit of 300 words for this section, while thoroughly reflecting your accomplishments and challenges. Provide links and/or citations as appropriate. Provide as many relevant examples as possible in the space provided below.

In FY19/20, USCG began conducting district-tailored training. A training team from HQ travels to individual USCG Districts to conduct training tailored to their specific area of responsibility (AOR), challenges, experience of staff, etc. Districts are briefed on policy updates and work on project-specific issues. The team also meets with district leadership to discuss Bridge Program priorities. In FY19/20, three in-person tailored trainings were completed. The trainings have improved the permitting process by ensuring districts have the latest guidance, templates, and instructions to process permit applications quickly and accurately. Due to COVID, the USCG is researching webinar opportunities, and plans to continue these smaller training sessions to offer a more tailored approach to field staff.

This information has been reviewed by the Permitting Council Member and CERPO, and others as necessary (public affairs, legislative affairs, office of general counsel staff). I understand that this information will be used as submitted in the FPISC Annual Report to Congress and is testimony-ready for use by Administration officials. ☑

CERPO Name (or designee)	Signature

SUBMIT

Permitting Council Member Agency Self-Assessment

Agency Input to FPISC's FY 2020 Annual Report to Congress

Section 1 Supplement

Please use this section to supplement Section 1. Examples of BP Implementation. Please submit this document with your Agency Self-Assessment form to FPISC OED by October 14, 2020

Best Practice Category: (iii) Improving coordination	Corresponding BP: iii.1 Standards and protocols
In FY20, DHS developed the directive and implementation plan for the Cultural Resource Management Program (017-01), which establishes policies and responsibilities for the appropriate creation and management of cultural resource programs throughout DHS and its components (issued in October 2020). The implementation plan lays out acceptable standards and protocols to be used with Federally Recognized Indian Tribes for the identification and treatment of resources that might be affected by infrastructure projects. Additionally, the DHS/USCG NEPA Warrant Program requires several hours of Cultural Resources training (the amount varies on the different warrant levels). NEPA warrants require	

Best Practice Category: (v) Reducing information coll	Corresponding BP: v.2 Joint processes or progra
In FY20, the USCG and USACE worked to redeveloped the interagency MOU from 1973. The updated MOU will provide clearer roles and responsibilities for the agencies in infrastructure projects, prevent duplicative processes, promote early and thorough coordination, and clarify the processes to resolve permitting processes that are dependent on one another for issuance. As an example, the CWA Section 404 permit cannot be issued without issuance of a Bridge Permit and vice versa. The MOU provides a path forward to ensure both permits may move forward without dependency on one or the other. The MOU is expected to be signed in FY21.	

Best Practice Category: (vii) Training materials	Corresponding BP: vii.1 Provide training about F
The Coast Guard conducts training to its district offices as part of its Bridge Program Leadership Team meetings. Implementation of FAST-41 training is a segment of that event. In addition, nearly all of the Bridge Program permitting personnel nationwide attended the FPISC-OED training in September 2020. Also, the Coast Guard continues to update it's Major Infrastructure Project webinar training, which is presented to field offices as they become involved in FAST-41 and OFD projects. Seven of nine Coast Guard Districts currently have (or have had) either FAST-41 or OFD projects and are integrating those procedures into their processes.	

Best Practice Category: (viii) Other	Corresponding BP: viii.1 Outreach to stakeholde
The Coast Guard, as lead federal agency for the OFD BNSF Rail Bridge (Bismarck Bridge) project, held several virtual Section 106 consultation meetings with stakeholders, NDSHPO and ACHP to discuss the draft Programmatic Agreement. This ensured all applicable stakeholders could attend regardless of COVID restrictions. The virtual meetings were very successful. Attendees were able to meet from their homes thereby saving time and money. About 35 individuals attended each meeting. Fewer people (around 20) attended previous in-person meetings due to funding restrictions associated with travel.	

Best Practice Category: (viii) Other	Corresponding BP: viii.1 Outreach to stakeholde

Best Practice Category: (i) Early stakeholder engagem	Corresponding BP: i.1 Early stakeholder engager

Best Practice Category: (i) Early stakeholder engagem	Corresponding BP: i.1 Early stakeholder engagem

Best Practice Category: (i) Early stakeholder engagem	Corresponding BP: i.1 Early stakeholder engager

SUBMIT