

**Report to the Council on Environmental Quality  
on Cooperating Agency (CA) Status  
March 1, 2003 to August 31, 2003**

• **Environmental Impact Statements:**

	<b>1.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>etc.</b>
<b>EIS (Title of EIS)</b>			
<b>Potential cooperating agencies (CAs) for the EIS</b>			
<b>CAs for the EIS (name agency[ies] that actually became CAs and their jurisdiction by law or special expertise)</b>			
<b>CA status not initiated or ended (name of agency; reason status was not initiated or was ended – use number from list below*)</b>			
<b>Initiation date (date of agency NOI in FR)</b>			

\*Examples of reasons CA status was not initiated or why it ended:

1. Lack of special expertise – identify the expertise sought by the lead agency and/or offered by the potential cooperating agency).
2. State, Tribal or local entity lacks authority to enter into an agreement to be a CA.
3. Potential CA unable to agree to participate during scoping and/or throughout the preparation of the analysis and documentation as necessary and meet milestones established for completing the process.
4. Potential or active CA unable or unwilling to identify significant issues, eliminate minor issues, identify issues previously studied, or identify conflicts with the objectives of regional, State and local land use plans, policies and controls in a timely manner.
5. Potential or active CA unable or unwilling to assist in preparing portions of the review and analysis and resolving significant environmental issues in a timely manner.
6. Potential or active CA unable or unwilling to provide resources to support scheduling and critical milestones.
7. Agency unable or unwilling to consistently participate in meetings or respond in a timely fashion after adequate time for review of documents, issues and analyses.
8. CA unwilling or unable to accept the lead agency's decision making authority regarding the scope of the analysis, including authority to define the purpose and need for the proposed action or to develop information/analysis of alternatives they favor and disfavor.
9. Agency unable or unwilling to provide data and rationale underlying the analyses or assessment of alternatives.
10. Agency releases predecisional information (including working drafts) in a manner that undermines or circumvents the agreement to work cooperatively before publishing draft or final analyses and documents.
11. Agency consistently misrepresents the process or the findings presented in the analysis and documentation.
12. Other. Identify the other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Report to the Council on Environmental Quality  
on Cooperating Agency (CA) Status**

*September 1, 2003 to February 29, 2004*

• **Environmental Impact Statements:**

	<b>1.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>etc.</b>
<b>EIS (Title of EIS)</b>			
<b>Potential cooperating agencies (CAs) for the EIS</b>			
<b>CAs for the EIS (name agency[ies] that actually became CAs and their jurisdiction by law or special expertise)</b>			
<b>CA status not initiated or ended (name of agency; reason status was not initiated or was ended – use number from list below*)</b>			
<b>Initiation date (date of agency NOI in FR)</b>			

\*Examples of reasons CA status was not initiated or why it ended:

1. Lack of special expertise – identify the expertise sought by the lead agency and/or offered by the potential cooperating agency).
2. State, Tribal or local entity lacks authority to enter into an agreement to be a CA.
3. Potential CA unable to agree to participate during scoping and/or throughout the preparation of the analysis and documentation as necessary and meet milestones established for completing the process.
4. Potential or active CA unable or unwilling to identify significant issues, eliminate minor issues, identify issues previously studied, or identify conflicts with the objectives of regional, State and local land use plans, policies and controls in a timely manner.
5. Potential or active CA unable or unwilling to assist in preparing portions of the review and analysis and resolving significant environmental issues in a timely manner.
6. Potential or active CA unable or unwilling to provide resources to support scheduling and critical milestones.
7. Agency unable or unwilling to consistently participate in meetings or respond in a timely fashion after adequate time for review of documents, issues and analyses.
8. CA unwilling or unable to accept the lead agency's decision making authority regarding the scope of the analysis, including authority to define the purpose and need for the proposed action or to develop information/analysis of alternatives they favor and disfavor.
9. Agency unable or unwilling to provide data and rationale underlying the analyses or assessment of alternatives.
10. Agency releases predecisional information (including working drafts) in a manner that undermines or circumvents the agreement to work cooperatively before publishing draft or final analyses and documents.
11. Agency consistently misrepresents the process or the findings presented in the analysis and documentation.
12. Other. Identify the other: \_\_\_\_\_.