

# SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION

(When Filled Out)



United States Coast Guard



## Facility Security Plan – Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) Secure Area Re-Definition

Review and Approval Checklist

### COTP

(For 105 facility review/approval)

#### Facility Information:

Facility Name	Identification Number	Type
---------------	-----------------------	------

**Directions:** Captains of the Port (COTP) should use this electronic checklist to document review and approval of Facility Security Plan (FSP) amendments submitted by a facility owner or operator requesting to re-designate portions of their facility that are directly connected to marine transportation or are at risk of being involved in a Transportation Security Incident (TSI) as their secure area for the purpose of TWIC implementation. When choosing the appropriate box, SUBSTITUTE the “□” symbol with the “■” symbol. For deficient or missing information, or entries deemed not applicable, choose the “See Comments Below” and provide an explanation on the comments page.

This checklist may be used to review and approve FSP amendments for applicable facilities regulated by 33 CFR 105.

**Reminder:** Upon receiving notification of intent or FSP amendment, a MISLE activity shall be created using the following:

- Activity Type: Facility Inspection
- Sub Activity Type: Security Plan Amendment Review
- Activity Title: TWIC – Secure Area Designation

At a minimum, the narrative shall include the date in which the amendment was received, a summary of the request, and a summary of the COTPs decision. Additionally, all documents (amendment request, amendment checklist, COTP acceptance/denial letter, etc.) shall be scanned into the MISLE Activity.

#### FACILITY SECURITY PLAN AMENDMENT

Reference	Condition	Satisfactory Addressed	Not Satisfactory Addressed	See Comments Below
33 CFR 105.415 NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	1. Did the facility owner or operator submit the FSP amendment to the COTP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.410(a)(1)	2. Did the facility owner or operator submit one copy of the FSP amendment for review and approval to the COTP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.410(a)(1)	3. Did the facility owner or operator submit a letter certifying that the FSP amendment meets the applicable requirements of 33 CFR Part 105?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	4. Does the FSP amendment define their secure area to cover only the maritime transportation portion of the facility where TWIC applicability will apply?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION

(When Filled Out)

## FACILITY SECURITY PLAN AMENDMENT

Reference	Condition	Satisfactory Addressed	Not Satisfactory Addressed	See Comments Below
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	5. Does the FSP amendment define non-maritime transportation portions of the facility where TWIC applicability does not apply?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	6. Did the description of the secure area take into account the risk of a TSI from the maritime transportation related portion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	7. Did the description of the non-maritime transportation portions take into account the risk of a TSI?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	8. Did the description of the secure area include the entire area within the outer-most access control perimeter of the facility (except public access areas), and encompass all restricted areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	9. Did the description of the secure area provide (through the use of a diagram and/or statements) statements that the secure area is bound by the fence line, gates, waterfront, and other means that provide access control to the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	10. Did the request include statements that some restricted areas fall outside the secure area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	11. Did the facility owner or operator's request consider the risk of a TSI, proximity to vessels and the waterfront, and hazards of cargo when determining whether restricted areas directly support or interface with the maritime transportation portion of the facility?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	12. Did the description of the secure area provide statements that the secure area has sufficient access control measures such as fencing, gates, monitoring, etc., in order to deter and restrict unauthorized persons from gaining access to the secure area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 CFR 105.115(c) NVIC 03-07, Enclosure (3)	13. Did the FSP amendment include updates to Section 10 ( <i>Security Measures for Access Control, Including Designated Public Access Areas</i> ) of the plan that describes how access control will be conducted for the secure area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

