



Maritime Asset Protection

August 28, 2019

Fiscal Year 2019 Report to Congress



Homeland
Security

United States Coast Guard

Foreword

August 28, 2019

I am pleased to present the following report, “Maritime Asset Protection,” which has been prepared by the U.S. Coast Guard

Senate Report 115-283 accompanying the Fiscal Year 2019 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act (P.L. 116-6) requires the submission of a report that details the capabilities of current waterborne marine barrier systems at Coast Guard facilities and that includes an assessment of their ability to adequately deter and defend against a waterborne attack.



Pursuant to congressional requirements, this report is being provided to the following Members of Congress:

The Honorable Lucille Roybal-Allard
Chairwoman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Chuck Fleischmann
Ranking Member, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Shelley Moore Capito
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Jon Tester
Ranking Member, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

I am happy to answer any further questions you may have, or your staff may contact my Senate Liaison Office at (202) 224-2913 or House Liaison Office at (202) 225-4775.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Karl L. Schultz". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end. It is positioned above the printed name and title.

Karl L. Schultz
Admiral, U. S. Coast Guard
Commandant



Maritime Asset Protection

Table of Contents

I. Legislative Language.....	1
II. Report.....	2

I. Legislative Language

This document responds to the language set forth in Senate Report 115-283 accompanying the Fiscal Year 2019 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act (P.L. 116-6).

Specifically, Senate Report 115-283 states:

The Committee recognizes that waterborne threats pose a significant challenge to protecting Coast Guard assets in port. Waterborne marine barrier systems play an important role in securing waterfront and offshore facilities from these threats. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this act, the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee a report detailing the capabilities of current waterborne marine barrier systems at Coast Guard facilities and shall include an assessment of their ability to adequately deter and defend against a waterborne attack.

II. Report

The U.S. Coast Guard currently does not employ waterborne barrier systems at any facilities. Historically, limited Coast Guard facilities employed waterborne barrier systems, but discontinued their use due to the negative operational impacts and cost associated with maintenance and operations of the systems. Specifically, the nature of the Coast Guard's missions dictates the need for a constant state of readiness and deployment at a moment's notice. These previously employed waterborne barrier systems required a vendor to arrive on site and to open the barrier system to permit a vessel's launch. Furthermore, each open/close operation was at a cost to the Coast Guard and system maintenance costs further burdened the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard's Maritime Security Risk Analysis Model was utilized to estimate the potential risk reduction from a terrorist small boat attack of a marine barrier system around a Coast Guard Cutter. The model's analysis of a terrorist small boat bomb attack scenario on a Coast Guard Cutter indicates that marine barriers can provide a conclusive reduction in risk; with a low precision estimate that it could reduce as much as 89 percent of the mitigated risk to a Coast Guard Cutter. However, the unmitigated risk of a terrorist small boat bomb attack is deemed to be "Low Risk" and the employment of waterborne barrier systems only mitigated this already "Low Risk" to a "Very Low Risk" level.

The negative operational impacts combined with the associated cost aspects of these systems make the employment of waterborne barrier systems in the current threat environment untenable. Further, the relatively low level of risk mitigation realized does not offset the negative operational impacts and associated costs. Taken together, these factors result in the absence of Coast Guard planning to employ such systems in the future.