

Chapter 5. Consultation and Coordination

5.1 Introduction

This document has been prepared with input from and coordination with interested agencies, organizations, tribal governments, and individuals. Planning is inherently a public process. The Bakersfield Field Office used a number of methods to work with the members of the public, interest groups, and governmental entities. Public involvement is a vital component of the *Federal Land Policy and Management Act* (FLPMA) and the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) for vesting concerned citizens in the planning process and allowing for full environmental disclosure. Guidance for implementing public involvement is contained in 40 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) 1601-1610, FPLMA Section 103(d), and the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ's) NEPA regulations at 40 CFR 1500-1508, and is intended to ensure that federal agencies make a diligent effort to involve the public in preparing planning and NEPA documents.

Formal public involvement opportunities for the Carrizo Plain National Monument (CPNM) Resource Management Plan (RMP) environmental impact statement (EIS) are being conducted in several ways including:

- Public scoping period prior to Draft RMP EIS development to obtain public input on issues that need to be addressed in developing the plan alternatives.
- Cooperating, coordinating, and collaborating with our cooperating partners the Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) includes progress report briefings and the formal effort of obtaining the advice or opinion of these organizations, although not considered consultation under 50 CFR 402.14
- Monument Advisory Committee progress report briefings and opportunities for public feedback during formulation of the Draft RMP EIS.
- Public review and comment on the Draft RMP EIS to recommend changes in the alternatives, identify gaps or errors in impact analysis, or provide input on other aspects of the draft for incorporation into development of the Proposed RMP / Final EIS.

Public involvement and other aspects of consultation and coordination are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

5.2 Public Scoping

The objectives of public scoping at the first phase of RMP development and NEPA analysis are to:

- Invite agencies and the public to participate;
- Identify a preliminary list of environmental and socioeconomic issues or themes to address in the NEPA document; and
- Identify and eliminate issues determined to be out of the scope of the RMP, or that can be addressed through means other than the planning process.

The full scoping report is available from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and is posted on the web at http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/bakersfield/Programs/planning/cpnm_rmp.html

5.2.1 Outreach

5.2.1.1 Notice of Intent

The scoping process for the CPNM RMP environmental assessment (EA) opened with publication of the initial notice of intent (NOI) in the Federal Register (67(79):20152-20153) on April 24, 2002. A revised NOI was published in the Federal Register on March 2, 2007 (72(41): 9578–9579) when the planning effort was changed from an EA to an EIS level of analysis. The NOIs notified the public of BLM’s intent to develop a plan and associated NEPA document for those lands within the CPNM boundary. The NOI also solicited public comments and participation. Participation from the initial 2002 scoping period and the 2007 scoping period were both used to frame issues for this RMP EIS.

5.2.1.2 Press Releases

Press releases were sent to local and major central California news media and posted on the BLM California website. Articles were published announcing the meetings in newspapers in the region including San Luis Obispo and Bakersfield.

5.2.1.3 Website

An informational website was activated on April 12, 2007. It provided background information on the CPNM, an outline of the planning process, a schedule of upcoming scoping meetings, and an opportunity for people to email comments directly to the BLM offices. This site received approximately 354 hits by June 30, 2007. In addition, 24 emails with scoping comments were received from the email address, cacarrizo@ca.blm.gov, on the BLM website.

5.2.1.4 Telephone

A phone number, (661) 391-6088, was made available for comments or questions about the planning process. This number only generated a small number of calls.

5.2.1.5 Mailing List Update Mailer

A postcard was sent to 577 people on March 28, 2007, asking recipients if they would like to receive a copy of the Draft RMP EIS. BLM produced special Planning Update mailers to announce the scoping effort. These were sent via direct mail on April 12, 2007. There were 557 people on the initial mailing list. The remainder of the 900-item print run was distributed as scoping session handouts and as people requested them. The Planning Update included background information on the CPNM, a description and timeline for the upcoming planning process, dates and locations of the public scoping meetings, and contact information for submitting public comments to BLM. It also contained a “Visioning Sheet” as an insert that people could fill out and mail back to BLM with their comments.

5.2.1.6 Public Meetings

Three public scoping meetings were held in 2007: in San Luis Obispo on April 24, in Bakersfield on May 1, and in California Valley on May 5. Attendance totaled 146 individuals, with the breakdown per meeting as follows:

San Luis Obispo: 63 people

Bakersfield: 37 people

Chapter 5. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

California Valley: 46 people

The meetings were held to gather information from the public on the future management of the CPNM. Participants were asked questions on what they valued about these lands, what kinds of activities or uses were important to them, and how they envisioned the area being managed in the future. Each of the meetings followed a similar format. Representatives of the CPNM Managing Partners (CDFG and TNC) attended all meetings. Representatives of the Monument Advisory Committee were also present at all meetings. A presentation was given highlighting key aspects of the planning process, outlining what the plan hoped to achieve, and describing the public's role in contributing to the plan direction and substance. After the presentation, BLM staff facilitated a question and answer period, and then members of the public were split into small groups for discussion. The facilitators guided participants through three questions regarding creating an overall vision for the CPNM, identifying goals and common values, and suggesting specific actions for achieving those goals. The groups then reconvened with the larger group to summarize their discussions.

The following organizations and agencies were represented among the people who signed in at the public meetings (in alphabetical order):

CDFG
Rotary Club of Taft
Sierra Club
The Wilderness Society
TNC

5.2.2 Public Scoping Results

A total of 3,470 responses were received, including 103 "Visioning Sheets" and 3,367 letters and emails with written comments. Of the letters, 3,296 were form letters.

Comments were received from 16 organizations:

Californians for Western Wilderness
California Wilderness Coalition
Center for Biological Diversity
Defenders of Wildlife
Los Padres ForestWatch
Natural Resources Defense Council
Sierra Club CA/NV Desert Committee
Sierra Club Santa Lucia Chapter
The Wilderness Society
Western Watersheds Project
Sierra Club Kern-Kaweah Chapter
Audubon California
California Native Plant Society, San Luis Obispo Chapter
Howard County Bird Club
Southern Sierra Archaeological Society
Ventura Audubon Society

The scoping input was used to formulate the issues addressed in the planning process, as described in Chapter 1 (see Section 1.5, Planning Themes and Issues, in Chapter 1). Chapter 1

also provides a summary of issues submitted during the input period that are beyond the scope of the RMP (see Section 1.6, Issues Considered but Not Further Analyzed, in Chapter 1). A full copy of the scoping report is available from the BLM or from the following website: http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/bakersfield/Programs/planning/cpnm_rmp.html

5.3 Additional RMP Collaboration, Coordination, and Cooperation

Coordination, cooperation, and the collaboration processes are required by FLPMA, NEPA, CEQ, and implementing regulations in the CFR. Many interactions as a result of this planning effort are shown below.

5.3.1 Plan Concepts Training

Staff from BLM, as well as a number of community members, attended a two-day “Planning Concepts Training Workshop” in January 2007 to introduce the participants to the BLM planning process. While this meeting was not a formal part of the scoping process, community participants provided input on planning and management concerns for the CPNM. Thirty-two people attended this training, including members of the Sierra Club, The Wilderness Society, TNC, and the Rotary Club of Taft.

5.3.2 Monument Advisory Committee, Managing Partners, Native American, and Cooperating Agency Participation

A number of key cooperators have played an integral role in RMP development. The respective roles of these entities—the Managing Partners (TNC and CDFG), Monument Advisory Committee, and Native American Advisory Committee—are outlined in Chapter 1 (for more information on these groups, see Section 1.10, Collaboration, in Chapter 1).

5.3.3 State of California (Including State Historic Preservation Officer) Consistency

The Draft RMP EIS is reviewed by appropriate state agencies for consistency with California state plans and policies. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS also undergoes a 60-day “Governor’s Consistency Review.” State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) have responsibilities under state law as well as under Section 101(b)(3) of the *National Historic Preservation Act* (NHPA) to “consult with the appropriate Federal agencies in accordance with [NHPA] on Federal undertakings that may affect historic properties, and the content and sufficiency of any plans developed to protect, manage, or to reduce or mitigate harm to such properties.” BLM will consult with the California SHPO on the CPNM RMP.

5.4 Public Review and Comment on the Draft RMP EIS

Following the official public scoping period, the next official public comment period will open upon publication of the Notice of Availability for this document (Draft RMP EIS) in the Federal Register. This will commence a 90-day public comment period. BLM will also announce the availability of the Draft RMP EIS by publishing notices of availability in local newspapers, on the project website, and through a Planning Update mailer. The Draft RMP EIS will be available for review and/or download from the project website. It will also be available by request in a bound paper format or via CD ROM. The Draft RMP EIS will be widely distributed to elected officials, regulatory agencies, interested organizations, and members of the public. Copies will also be available at local libraries and by request.

During the 90-day public comment period, public meetings will be held in Bakersfield, San Luis Obispo, and in conjunction with a Monument Advisory Committee meeting in California Valley.

5.5 Completion of the Planning Process

At the conclusion of the public comment period on the Draft RMP EIS, the comments will be incorporated into an updated document: the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be announced in the Federal Register, and a 30-calendar-day public protest period will follow. Anyone considering protesting the proposed plan may meet with BLM to discuss his or her protest concerns. At the conclusion of the public protest period, the BLM Director will evaluate and resolve any protests. After protests are resolved, the BLM California State Director will publish the approved RMP and Record of Decision. Its availability will be announced through the mailing list, website, and regional media.

5.6 List of Preparers

This RMP/EIS has been prepared by an interdisciplinary team of resource specialists from the Managing Partners. In addition, assistance was provided from specialists at the BLM state office and from Labat Environmental and Terra Nova consulting firms. The following table lists members of the planning team and their job title.

Table 5.5-1. List of Preparers

Name	Job Title
<i>BLM Bakersfield Field Office</i>	
Duane Christian	Archaeologist
David Christy	Public Affairs Officer
Ryan Cooper	Recreation Planner
Karen Doran	Rangeland Management Specialist
Joy Fatooh (Bishop Field Office)	Wildlife Biologist
Gabe Garcia	Assistant Field Manager, Minerals
Patricia Gradek	Acting Field Manager (through 6/07)
Johna Hurl	National Monument Manager
Denis Kearns	Botanist
Amy Kuritsubo	Wildlife Biologist
Stephen Larson	Assistant Field Manager, Resources
Sue Lopez	Realty Specialist
Jeff Prude	Petroleum Engineer
Chris Ryan	Soil, Air, and Water Specialist
Nancy Ryan (volunteer)	Administrative Support
Judith Sackett	Administrative Support
Larry Saslaw	Wildlife Biologist
Kathy Sharum	Wildlife Biologist
John Skibinski	Associate Field Manager
Tim Smith	Field Manager (6/07–present)
Diane Simpson	Recreation Planner
Dylan Tucker	Range Conservationist
Kent Varvel	Hazardous Materials
Larry Vredenburgh	Geologist and GIS Coordinator
Bob Wick	Project Lead (through 5/08)
Katherine Worn	Project Lead (6/08–present)
Pat York (U.S. Forest Service)	Planner

Name	Job Title
<i>California Department of Fish and Game</i>	
Deborah Hillyard	Staff Environmental Scientist
Bob Stafford	Associate Wildlife Biologist
<i>The Nature Conservancy</i>	
Tom Maloney	San Luis Obispo Program Director
Scott Butterfield	Ecoregional Scientist
<i>California State University, Sonoma</i>	
Caroline Christian	Associate Professor, Dept. of Env. Studies
<i>BLM California State Office</i>	
Dianna Brink	Rangeland Coordinator
Paul Brink	Wilderness Coordinator
Steve Kupferman	Geologist
Sandra McGinnis	Planning and NEPA Coordinator
Lenore Thomas	Hydrologist
Ken Wilson	Archaeologist, Tribal Liaison
<i>Labat Environmental and Terra Nova (Consultants)</i>	
Christine Modovsky (Labat Environmental)	NEPA Specialist / Consultant Team Manager
Jennifer Knuth (Labat Environmental)	Technical Editor / Cultural Resources Specialist
Tamar Krantz (Labat Environmental)	Technical Editor / Environmental Scientist
Laura Alstadt (Terra Nova)	Environmental and Socioeconomic Specialist
John Criste (Terra Nova)	Environmental Planner

5.7 Advisory Committees

The following committees provided advice during development of the RMP.

Table 5.6-1. Carrizo Plain National Monument Advisory Committee

Name (Title)	Represents
Neil Havlik, PhD (Chair)	Public at Large
Ellen Cypher (Vice Chair)	Public at Large
Raymond Hatch	Public at Large
Michael Khus-Zarate	Carrizo Plain Native American Advisory Committee
Dale Kuhnle	Grazing
Robert Pavlik	Public at Large
Jim Patterson	San Luis Obispo County Supervisor, District 5
Carl Twisselman	BLM Central California Advisory Council

Table 5.6-2. Carrizo Plain Native American Advisory Committee

Name (Title)	Represents
Michael Khus-Zarate (Chair)	Chumash
Robert Duckworth (Vice Chair)	Salinan
Elmer Castro	Chumash