

**LEAVING a 4 C's LEGACY**  
*A FRAMEWORK FOR SHARED COMMUNITY STEWARDSHIP*

**Report to the Assistant Secretary of Land & Minerals  
Management**  
*On 4 C's Principles, Elements, Barriers, Projects & Tools*

By

**The 4 C's Working Group**

July 2003

## **PREFACE**

This report is about an idea – the idea of shared community stewardship and its application to the management of public lands. It is an idea whose roots are firmly planted in the pioneering efforts of bureau staff whose hard work and high creativity over the years have laid the administrative foundation for further developing community stewardship. It is an idea that builds on the bureau's long legacy of collaboration and cooperation to now engage the American people in partnered conservation and the next level of resource governance innovation: shared community stewardship of the public lands.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Assistant Secretary of Land & Minerals Management established a Bureau of Land Management (BLM) 4 C's Working Group and instructed the group in a memorandum dated 10 June 2002 to: (a) identify and document existing shared community stewardship projects with particular attention to the means or tools used to implement those projects; (b) explore future pilot projects that could be developed and, particularly, consider some of the ideas suggested in the paper by Matthew McKinney, "Options to Create Pilot Projects on Federal Lands Governance"; and (c) identify barriers to the growth and development of those projects and determine how to address those barriers.

The 4 C's Working Group addressed the Assistant Secretary's instruction in two phases. In Phase One (completed September 2002), the Group prepared and issued a report on existing shared community stewardship projects and tools entitled. In Phase Two, the Group addressed the remaining informational needs of the Assistant Secretary.

The proposed mission, goal and objectives of the report are based on the presumption of stewardship of public lands *by the American people, with the American people and of the American people*. Place-based partnerships and participatory problem solving are foundational. They enable, enhance and expand the role and responsibility of citizens in the use, care and protection of public lands. They also advance the conservation objectives of (1) sustaining working landscapes, (2) fostering innovations in natural resource management and governance, (3) institutionalizing the concept of shared community stewardship in the culture and operations of the BLM, and (4) instituting outcome-based management of natural resources.

The *Framework for Shared Community Stewardship* is envisioned as a bottom-up, bureau-wide initiative that (1) builds on the successes of the Bureau to date, (2) supports planned or proposed projects in the near-term, and (3) fosters and facilitates the innovation and creativity needed to multiply efforts and take them to the next and higher level of shared community stewardship of public lands, embracing and ranging from traditional partnerships to Alternative Dispute Resolution to consensus-based management to third-party monitoring and assessment to adaptive, outcome-based management. Eight principles structure and guide the Initiative. The initiative should be:

- Structured around existing administrative tools
- Applied to advance systemic change, not experimentation, within the Bureau
- Fully integrated within Bureau administration – *a seamless service to facilitate ongoing innovation and help managers reach new levels of community stewardship*
- Fully transparent and accessible to the public in its implementation
- Inclusive of monitoring and public oversight and reporting in its applications
- Subject in its short-term organizational format to a sunset provision consistent with its mission, goal and objectives of full institutionalization within BLM culture
- Inclusive, bottom-up, participatory and place-based in its operation

- Systemically applied to encourage and solicit a broad diversity in projects extending from traditional partnerships to new forms of shared stewardship and governance

Structural elements to enhance the Initiative include project development considerations, project selection consideration, project scope, administrative considerations, advisory components, project monitoring, and Departmental participation.

Barriers to implementation and solutions to those barriers are divided into 7 categories: (1) cultural; (2) community; (3) administrative; (4) management; (5) budgetary, financial, procurement and contracting; (6) informational, and (7) support. Cultural barriers are often subtle impediments and include attitudes, training, institutional, and personnel practices that unintentionally compromise or undermine BLM-community relationships. Community barriers include skill and capacity gaps within communities and among community leaders, and may involve conflicts between traditional or emerging community value systems and agency values and mission. Administrative barriers include process and regulatory impediments. Management barriers include performance elements inconsistent with the shared community stewardship concepts and knowledge, skill and ability gaps among field managers and staff. Budgetary, financial, procurement and contracting barriers include a broad range of funding and resource allocation factors limiting or adversely affecting implementation of stewardship projects. The Informational barrier pertains to the challenges of disseminating essential data and knowledge. The support barrier points to the critical role of Departmental and agency support for the ultimate success of the Initiative. Recommended solutions to each of the seven barriers are provided.

Twenty-three proposed or early-stage projects are highlighted to suggest (a) the diverse constellation of projects now underway or planned that meet the purpose and criteria of the Initiative and (b) potential candidates for selection and support. Projects are compartmentalized into four groups:

- [Community-Based Landscape Restoration Projects](#)
- [Community-Based Planning and Plan Implementation Projects](#)
- [Community-Based 4 C's Partnerships and Agreements](#)
- [Community-Based Programmatic/Institutional Initiatives](#)

Final recommendations to the Assistant Secretary are provided. The final recommendations summarize the key recommendations listed elsewhere in the report, particularly in the section on barriers and solutions. The final recommendations reflect the key principles underlying the initiative's operation, the centrality of Resource Advisory Councils, the necessity for a term coordinator position, funding suggestions, personnel training and strategic placement, and award recognition for agency personnel and public partners exhibiting outstanding leadership in the advancement of the mission, goal and objectives of the initiative.

Three Attachments are included at the end of the report. Attachment One includes: (a) the Phase One report 4 C's Tools: Overview and Summary [reviewed and evaluated over 80 current BLM projects and extracted from them a total of 26 administrative tools for the implementation of 4 C's projects]; (b) copy of the instruction memorandum of 10 June 2002 from the Assistant Secretary requesting the Working Group to prepare the report at hand; (c) copy of Matthew McKinney's paper "Options to Create Pilot Projects on Federal Lands Governance";

and (d) a reference table to the projects, activities and proposals incorporated in 4 C's Tools: Overview and Summary.

Attachment Two is a draft 3-year work plan for the proposed term coordinator position. It is preliminary and subject to revision by the bureau. It was developed by Richard Whitley, member of the Working Group and tasked to the Assistant Secretary, Land & Minerals Management, from 2/03 to 5/03 for the purpose of assisting in the development of the initiative.

Attachment Three discusses factors to consider for project selection and operation. These factors were identified by the Working Group and are presented here only as guides or suggestions for later implementation. The factors are intended to help the BLM focus on efforts that contribute most to the ideals of citizen conservation and community stewardship. They are meant to help direct and leverage the allocation of time and resources not impose standards on Field Offices for collaborative activities or otherwise restrict the freedom of Field Managers to exercise their discretion. The factors are guidance for the *Framework for Shared Community Stewardship* – the roadmap to identify which projects, by virtue of their selection, will lead the bureau most expeditiously in the direction of community stewardship and what operational and administrative mechanisms will best provide the driving force to get there.

The factors are divided into two categories: (1) project selection factors – *which collaborative and partnered projects best match the citizen conservation and community stewardship purpose* and (2) project operation factors – *what are the operational expectations for projects and what sidebars should be reasonably anticipated in their implementation?*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
Preface	2
Executive Summary	3
Table of Contents	7
I. Introduction	8
II. Proposed Mission, Goal and Objectives Statement	10
III. Elements for Enhancing a 4 C's Initiative	12
IV. Barriers and Solutions to Success of the 4 C's Initiative	24
V. Range of Existing and Suggested Candidate 4 C's Projects	40
VI. Final Recommendations of the 4 C's Working Group	83
VII. Attachment One – 4 C's Tools: <i>Overview and Summary</i>	86
<u>4 C's Tools: <i>Overview and Summary</i></u>	90
Assistant Secretary Memorandum of 10 June 2002	108
Matthew McKinney Report	109
Reference Table of 4 C's Projects	113
VIII. Attachment Two – Draft 3-Year Work Plan for 4 C's Coordinator	115
IX. Attachment Three – Factors to Consider for 4 C's Project Selection/Operation	119

## LEAVING a 4C's LEGACY: A FRAMEWORK FOR BUILDING COMMUNITY STEWARDSHIP

### Report to the Assistant Secretary of Land & Minerals Management On 4 C's Principles, Focus, Barriers, Projects & Tools

If we challenge the American people, we will create a new generation of citizen-conservationists, people who know the land, love the land, and take care of the land in the greatest tradition of our nation. Working together, we will get the job done.

Gale Norton, Secretary of the Interior, April 18, 2002

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The policy framework for management of public lands is set by the Secretary of the Interior's 4 C's agenda – *conservation through cooperation, communication and consultation* – and the new environmentalism, centered on the goal of citizen stewardship. The Secretary's 4 C's and the new environmentalism set forth a common vision for a new relationship between the public and the public lands. They call for and support the rise of citizen stewardship as the principal means to conserve and protect the nation's lands, waters and wildlife. The new environmentalism and the 4 C's provide the guidance and means to put collaboration and partnership ahead of conflict and polarization. They are the policy foundation upon which to build a lasting legacy of citizen stewardship through environmental innovation, incentives for stewardship, local information for place-based conservation, and integrated decision-making. Together, they reaffirm every citizen's obligation to the land, redefine the stewardship role of people who engage in the use of public lands to hands-on planning and management, and measure our success and performance in leaving the land in a healthier state than we found it. Both celebrate the partnerships that enable citizen stewardship. Both establish the immediacy and need for a BLM 4 C's Initiative that can (1) build on the collaborative traditions and creativity of the bureau, (2) extend and realize the conservation vision of the Secretary, and (3) culminate in shared community stewardship of the public lands as indicated by a range of partnered, collaborative, and shared governance activities and arrangements, including conventional partnerships, consensus-based management, Alternative Dispute Resolution, third-party monitoring and assessment, and adaptive, outcome-based management.

To this end, the Assistant Secretary for Land & Minerals Management established the 4 C's Working Group<sup>1</sup> in a memorandum of 10 June 2002 (included in Attachment One). The Working

---

<sup>1</sup> Members of the 4 C's task group are: **Bob Abbey**, Nevada State Director (775-861-6590, [Bob\\_Abbey@nv.blm.gov](mailto:Bob_Abbey@nv.blm.gov)), **Ann Aldrich**, Group Manager, Planning (202-452-7722, [Ann\\_B\\_Aldrich@blm.gov](mailto:Ann_B_Aldrich@blm.gov)), **Elena Daly**, Director, National Landscape Conservation System (202-208-3516, [Elena\\_Daly@blm.gov](mailto:Elena_Daly@blm.gov)), **Tom Dyer**, Field Manager, Burns, OR, (541-573-4422, [Thomas\\_Dyer@or.blm.gov](mailto:Thomas_Dyer@or.blm.gov)), **Karl Hess**, Advisor to the Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget (202-208-1378, [Karl\\_Hess@ios.doi.gov](mailto:Karl_Hess@ios.doi.gov)), **Ron Huntsinger**, Field Manager, Taos, NM (505-751-4700, [Ron\\_Huntsinger@nm.blm.gov](mailto:Ron_Huntsinger@nm.blm.gov)), **Kit Kimball**, Director of Inter-Governmental and External Affairs (202-208-1923, [Kit\\_Kimball@ios.doi.gov](mailto:Kit_Kimball@ios.doi.gov)), **Cynthia Moses-**

Group was instructed by the Assistant Secretary to consider the creation of a 4 C's Initiative – a *Framework for Shared Community Stewardship* – within the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) that would (1) provide institutionally seamless support for systemic adoption and growth of the 4 C's within the bureau and (2) amplify and extend 4 C's innovation to the next and higher participatory level of shared community stewardship of public lands, and to report to her its findings. The group was also instructed to consider some of the ideas suggested in the paper by Matthew McKinney, "Options to Create Pilot Projects on Federal Lands Governance" (included in Attachment One). Specifically, the Assistant Secretary requested preparation of a comprehensive report to:

- [Document](#) existing 4 C's projects and [identify](#) the administrative tools used to implement them
- [Explore](#) future 4 C's projects
- [Develop](#) a framework for operation of a 4 C's Projects Program and [identify](#) factors for project selection and implementation
- [Identify](#) barriers to the development of 4 C's projects
- [Examine](#) how BLM is responding to or could respond to those barriers

The 4 C's Initiative is intended to advance the Secretary's 4 C's agenda – *conservation through cooperation, communication and consultation* – on federal lands managed by the BLM and among citizens who wish to participate in the planning, management and stewardship of those lands. The 4 C's constitute the policy framework and operational objective for the Department of the Interior in its management of lands and resources and in its engagement with land owners, land users, local and State governments, tribes and the general public for the purposes of conservation and management of land, water and wildlife. The 4 C's policy is also intended to acknowledge and encourage the commitment of agency personnel in pursuing ongoing projects that are consistent with and further the goals of citizen conservation, citizen-government partnerships, and community stewardship.

The 4 C's Initiative is structured pursuant to the policy framework and the operational objective of the 4 C's. One, It seeks to advance citizen stewardship on public lands through existing and new mechanisms of individual and community-based partnership and participation with the BLM. Two, it strives to foster landscape-level conservation and sustain working landscapes for the mutual benefit of natural and human communities. The 4 C's Initiative is the institutional umbrella under which projects on BLM lands that advance the Secretary's 4 C's agenda and the general purposes of community stewardship can be more fully and consistently supported. Moreover, it is under that institutional umbrella that (1) lessons learned from those projects can be disseminated to managers, staff and the public, (2) barriers to project implementation can be addressed, and (3) the 4 C's agenda can be assimilated into all aspects of bureau operations and culture.

The first of the five tasks requested by the Assistant Secretary – documenting existing projects consistent with the 4 C's and identifying the administrative tools used to implement them – was completed in September 2002 and is included at the end of this report as Attachment One. A reference table of 4 C's projects is also included. That paper – [4 C's Tools: Overview and](#)

---

[Nedd](#), NACo Liaison (202-452-5114, [Cynthia.Moses-Nedd@blm.gov](mailto:Cynthia.Moses-Nedd@blm.gov)), [Bob Ratcliffe](#), Deputy Group Manager, Recreation and Visitor Services (202-452-5040, [Bob.Ratcliffe@blm.gov](mailto:Bob.Ratcliffe@blm.gov)), [Mike Taylor](#), Arizona Deputy State Director (602-417-9230, [Michael.Taylor@az.blm.gov](mailto:Michael.Taylor@az.blm.gov)), [Rich Whitley](#), NM Assistant State Director (505-438-7501, [Richard.Whitley@nm.blm.gov](mailto:Richard.Whitley@nm.blm.gov)).

Summary – reviewed and evaluated over 80 current BLM 4 C's projects and extracted from them a total of 26 administrative tools for the implementation of 4 C's projects. Those tools are not exhaustive, however. They are based on a single snapshot in time of the 4 C's achievements of the bureau. They will be enhanced and expanded in proportion to the systemic adoption of 4 C's goals and methodologies by Field Managers, and their elevation to the next and higher participatory governance level of shared community stewardship.

The remaining four tasks requested by the Assistant Secretary are addressed in this paper. Those tasks – in addition to an overview and proposal on statements of mission, goal and objectives for the 4 C's Initiative (presented immediately below) and principal concluding recommendations of the Working Group to the Assistant Secretary for the initiative's seamless integration into bureau operations – include:

- ***Elements for Enhancing the 4 C's Initiative*** – What is the 4 C's Initiative and how should it be structured and advanced pursuant to the Secretary's 4 C's agenda?
- ***Factors to Consider for 4 C's Project Selection and Operation*** – What are the selection factors for identifying and choosing 4 C's projects for initiative support, and what are the operational guidelines to implement and administer projects consistent with the Secretary's 4 C's agenda and the mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative?
- ***Barriers and Solutions to Success of the 4 C's Initiative*** – What are the primary obstacles to institutionalizing the 4 C's and advancing the general community stewardship purpose of the 4 C's Initiative and its specific activities on BLM public lands? How can those obstacles be addressed to further the Secretary's 4 C's agenda and ensure success of the 4 C's Initiative?
- ***Range of Existing and Suggested Candidate 4 C's Projects*** – What does the current universe of 4 C's projects look like, what are examples of potential candidate projects for support, and how would these projects advance the mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative?
- ***Final Recommendations of the 4 C's Working Group*** – What principal guidelines and actions are recommended to the Assistant Secretary for long-term success of the 4 C's Initiative as measured by its mission, goal and objectives?

Unlike the first, third, fourth and fifth tasks, which are addressed in the main body of the report, the second task – *Factors to Consider for 4 C's Project Selection and Operation* – is addressed in Attachment Three. Although potentially contributory to the implementation of the 4 C's Initiative by the BLM, the Working Group determined that it was not essential to the primary purpose of the report. Attachment One is referenced above. Attachment Two contains a draft 3-year work plan for the recommended 4 C's term-appointed coordinator.

## II. PROPOSED MISSION, GOAL AND OBJECTIVES STATEMENT

The 4 C's Initiative (1) seeks to minimize government's more traditional management practices, (2) reaffirm and advance citizen-focused management practices that have arisen in tandem with the BLM's long-term commitment to community-based collaboration and partnership, and (3) expand the ongoing 4 C's practices of the BLM to new and higher levels of community participation and governance innovation. These opportunities are poised to move the bureau from traditional 4 C's forms of collaborative and partnered management toward institutional and cultural commitment to shared community stewardship of public lands including, but not limited to, consensus- and community-based planning, comprehensive use of Alternative Dispute Resolution tools, citizen-based and/or third party monitoring and assessment, and adaptive, outcome-based management. The members of the 4 C's Working Group have been involved in a range of collaborative, shared stewardship and innovative governance activities and projects for some time and consider it fundamental that the guiding mission for a 4 C's Initiative within the bureau would be – and properly should be – *shared stewardship of public lands by the American people, with the American people and of the American people*. Given the significance and magnitude of this shift in management emphasis, the Working Group proposes the following working statements of mission, goal and objectives:

### Proposed Mission Statement

*Public lands provide multiple material and spiritual goods and services to individuals, communities and the nation. The mission of the 4 C's Initiative – founded on the Secretary's 4 C's agenda of conservation through cooperation, communication and consultation – is to make shared community stewardship of America's public lands the BLM's operating business principle and its primary directive for land restoration, place-based conservation and sustainable resource use in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.*

### Proposed Goal and Objectives Statement

*The goal of the 4 C's Initiative is to facilitate partnerships for shared community stewardship that:*

- 1. Provide for individual and community responsibility in the planning and management of public lands;*
- 2. Embrace integrated, landscape-level approaches to conservation and sustainable land use;*
- 3. Ally working landscapes with the conservation and protection of natural and human communities.*

*Con't:*

- 4. Advance innovations in natural resource and land governance in partnership with the BLM;*
- 5. Institutionalize within BLM and its staff a commitment to the values, processes and outcomes of shared community stewardship, enhanced public participation and innovative governance strategies as necessary and allowed by the agency's mission;*
- 6. Expand opportunities for citizens to directly engage in the use, care and protection of public lands and resources now and in the future; and*
- 7. Result in management, and measures of management success, that are performance driven and outcome-based and that manifest themselves in healthy landscapes, dynamic economies and thriving communities.*

#### **4 C's Working Group Recommendation**

Pursuant to the spirit of the Secretary's 4 C's agenda and the community stewardship mission of the 4 C's Initiative, the 4 C's Working Group recommends to the Assistant Secretary full cooperation, communication and consultation with public land communities, interest groups and constituencies, including the National Association of Counties (NACo), the Western Governor's Association (WGA), land user associations, conservation groups engaged in community outreach and native American tribes in the final determination of the initiative's statements of mission, goal and objectives and in the configuration of its operational characteristics.

### III. ELEMENTS FOR ENHANCING THE 4 C's INITIATIVE

Shared community stewardship to enhance natural resource health is the overriding mission of the 4 C's Initiative and the primary framework and guidance for building community participation for the care and conservation of the public lands. BLM is well positioned to move its own efforts at partnership and collaboration into this next level of public involvement. BLM is committed to making public land management (1) collaborative, transparent and inclusive; (2) place-based and citizen- and community-driven; (3) participatory and landscape-based; and (4) targeted to environmental and land management performance and conservation outcomes that address the health and well-being of natural and human communities.

Shared community stewardship is the anticipated and desired end-point of citizen-based conservation of the public lands. Through its long tradition of collaborative partnerships BLM is poised to realize the potential of shared community stewardship by extending and enhancing already existing administrative options for public involvement in decision-making. The full range and capability of those options for enabling innovative and participatory governance of the public lands is yet to be discovered, but the known possibilities are many and are manifested by:

- Evolving processes for consensus- and community-based planning (La Cienegas National Conservation Area);
- An open-ended and dynamic future for the role and contributions of Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) and sub-groups;
- New and innovative institutional arrangements for shared management of discrete land areas (Sand Flats Recreation Area, Utah) as well as extensive landscapes (Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project);
- Emergent opportunities for citizen participation in monitoring and assessment of public land management;
- A proliferating richness in and democratic application of the tools of Alternative Conflict Resolution; and
- Promises of participatory governance that are imbedded in the unfolding nature of adaptive, outcome-based management.

All of these developments, anchored in a meritorious past, are silently yet resolutely moving the bureau and the public toward a future of citizen-based conservation – a promised legacy whose defining characteristic is *shared community stewardship of public lands by the American people, with the American people and of the American people*. This is the 4 C's Initiative. It builds upon the bureau's past and present and it looks toward tomorrow for its guidance. It implements both the Secretary of the Interior's 4 C's agenda – *conservation through cooperation, communication and consultation* – and the new environmentalism, both of which highlight and rely upon *citizen participation in stewardship and individual and community volunteerism*.

The new environmentalism sets the broad conceptual framework for the 4 C's and the 4 C's

Initiative. Its principles include:

- ***Innovation.*** Many of our most intractable environmental problems resist solution for lack of creative ideas and new conservation arrangements. One goal of the 4 C's Initiative is to encourage, facilitate and foster innovation by focusing on management outcomes, not management prescriptions. Innovation refers both to new techniques (e.g., seasonal grazing in riparian areas, solar fencing, GIS-based planning models, GPS, web-based information systems and other technologies) and new institutional arrangements (e.g., Resource Advisory Councils, "grass banks," consensus-based planning, mitigation banks, conservation land trusts, conservation easements, citizen advisory councils, new cooperating agency status for local governments, citizen oversight groups, shared governance arrangements, contracts and other partnerships and agreements).
- ***Incentives.*** For years, the threat and application of punishment (fines, enforcement actions, etc.) have been the tools used by agencies to persuade people to practice conservation. But people are most likely to practice conservation when engaged as peers, and given positive reasons to participate. The challenge is to identify the policies and institutions that will best nurture incentives for conservation and stewardship by the people who use the public lands, whether for work or for recreation. The 4 C's Initiative is intended to help support and develop a nation of self-motivated citizen stewards by ensuring that federal policies and regulations are conducive to a wide range of shared stewardship opportunities.
- ***Place-Based Information and Knowledge.*** Place-based information and knowledge are integral to the practice and success of the 4 C's Initiative. People closest to a situation, whether measured in terms of physical proximity or a record of experience irrespective of residence, frequently know the best conservation and land management approaches because they often have the best "on-the-ground" information. This especially applies to place-based decision-making. Good environmental decisions must be tailored to circumstances. This requires decision-making that taps information of locality and that incorporates knowledge of time, place, and circumstance. The expert knowledge and science applied by land managers are an important part of this. So, too, is experiential knowledge – the knowledge of the individual rancher, farmer, recreationist, conservationist, resource specialist or other resource user who knows the landscape in which he or she works or plays. Each stream, each pasture, each valley and upland has its own tale, its own particular story – details that matter immensely when deciding among conservation options.
- ***Integrated Decision-Making.*** Integrated decision-making is instrumental to the 4 C's Initiative. In the past, many of our environmental institutions and policies partitioned decisions about air from decisions about water and waste, decisions about one species from another species, decisions about the management of uplands from wetlands, and decisions about the needs of public lands from the requirements of adjacent private, state, tribal or federal lands. Better conservation efforts require more holistic, integrated decisions in which we consider whole landscapes and in which we blend environmental, community, and economic goals. The challenge is to discern which institutions and decision-making settings will enable us to attain this blending of goals and values.

The new environmentalism departs from the framework of past environmental policy. As noted above, it rejects the notion of piecemeal solutions to otherwise holistic environmental problems and challenges the desirability and sustainability of solutions prescribed from the top down. It seeks solutions that are voluntarily embraced and implemented. More importantly, it puts process in proper perspective. For many years, the environmental success of many federal agencies has been measured more by what they have done procedurally – the issuance of permits and compliance with decision-making procedures – than by what they have done “on-the-ground” to advance conservation. The new environmentalism is performance and outcome-based. It measures environmental success by what is accomplished “on-the-ground” toward the attainment of public landscape goals: *the actual conservation of land, water, and wildlife*.

The new environmentalism embraces the Secretary’s 4 C’s agenda to foster innovation, create incentives for citizen stewardship, tap local information of both experts and local residents, provide integrated decision-making, and to make conservation outcomes, not administrative procedure and process, the touchstone of environmental achievement. In turn, the 4 C’s agenda and the 4 C’s Initiative are the Department’s and the BLM’s implementation vehicles for the new environmentalism on America’s vast federal estate. They reaffirm the obligation of all Americans to the land, redefine and reinvigorate the stewardship role of people who engage in the use of public lands, and measure our success and performance in creating and maintaining healthy landscapes. Each element of the 4 C’s contributes toward these several ends. Specifically:

- **Cooperation** signifies the Department’s and the BLM’s commitment to working in partnership with all citizens to manage, conserve and protect public lands for present and future generations. Cooperation rests on voluntary action and depends on the incentive-based tools that enable effective volunteerism.
- **Communication** signifies the Department’s and the BLM’s commitment to transparency and accountability in its management of natural resources. Communication highlights the ongoing dialogue for conservation innovation that occurs through the unencumbered exchange of ideas. Innovation, in turn, is the wellspring of the 4 C’s Initiative, the 4 C’s agenda and the new environmentalism.
- **Consultation** signifies the Department’s and the BLM’s commitment to seeking the views of all interested citizens and more fully engaging those citizens in the management of public lands. Consultation implies integrated decision-making and landscape-level action consistent with legal rights and contracts. Consultation affirms the Department’s and the BLM’s commitment to working with interested citizens to incorporate local information and knowledge in addressing place-based conservation and land management challenges.

The Secretary’s 4 C’s agenda and the new environmentalism set-forth the basic framework of the 4 C’s Initiative – its commitment to citizen stewardship. Consistent with this commitment, the 4 C’s Initiative is not experimental; it is not envisioned as a series of pilot projects designed to demonstrate, assess or evaluate the efficacy and desirability of shared stewardship on public lands. Rather, the 4 C’s Initiative will build upon the 4 C’s successes of the past, seeking new and more comprehensive venues and opportunities for the full expression of citizen stewardship on public lands. The initiative presupposes that shared stewardship of public lands by the people, with the people and of the people in partnership with the BLM is right in a nation dedicated to democratic principles. The issue addressed by this report is not whether the 4 C’s

work, but how the 4 C's concepts can be refined, expanded upon and systematically advanced and how, ultimately, the concepts can be inculcated into the culture and everyday business of the BLM. Projects are one vehicle by which to attain this institutionalization.

Fully integrating the 4 C's into every aspect of bureau culture and operations has distinct advantages for the BLM, participating communities and natural resources. They include:

- More efficient and effective use of agency resources by shortening the learning curve of field managers and better preparing them for engaging their constituencies creatively and positively in community stewardship;
- Increased bureau capacity to extend its current shared conservation activities to all Field Offices and expand 4 C's innovation and experimentation to expedite and attain the outcome of shared community stewardship;
- Expanded focus and application of 4 C's from single or traditional constituencies to broader communities of interest and place;
- Greater appreciation for the power of partnerships in leveraging scarce budget dollars and in meeting resource management goals and objectives: shared stewardship is not just an economic reality, it is also a social and political necessity;
- Adoption of a land management ethic and methodology that is most consistent with democratic values and public demands for stewardship participation;
- Orienting agency management and operations increasingly toward performance, outcome and participatory decision-making;
- Greater likelihood that 4 C's implementation will no longer depend on charismatic leaders within the agency;
- A shift from the agency being the exclusive "doer" to becoming the "facilitator" of management, and from being the "controller" of management to becoming a "partner" with citizens in management;
- Enabling the agency to respond appropriately and effectively to community demands for a new way of doing business on public lands;
- Creating capacity within local communities to join with BLM in shared stewardship of public lands; and
- Promoting within communities of place and interest a sustained sense and acceptance of responsibility for the long-term management of the lands and resources they use and upon which they depend for work, recreation and a healthy living.

In summary, the general purposes of the 4 C's Initiative are essentially two-fold: One, to identify the tools, institutions and guiding rules by which stewardship partnerships can be best fostered and directed toward environmental outcomes that are sought locally, regionally and nationally and Two, to support and facilitate implementation of stewardship partnerships to advance

citizen conservation in the general population and to institutionalize citizen participation in the guidance, policies, regulations and operating principles of the BLM and its staff. Underlying the broader purpose of the initiative is a commitment to advance conservation on working landscapes through shared partnerships using a myriad of mechanisms, including:

- New forms of participatory planning and decision-making;
- Innovative management arrangements that incorporate citizens into the care and stewardship of public lands; and
- Educational and programmatic efforts that prepare all stakeholders for partnered stewardship and that promote within the agency a shared culture and commitment to the pursuit of citizen-centered conservation.

Within the foundational framework determined by the Secretary's 4 C's agenda and the new environmentalism of the Administration, the 4 C's Working Group has identified and recommends a series of additional principles and elements necessary to make that framework whole, robust and appropriate to the mission, goal and objectives as set forth, above, for the 4 C's Initiative. The principles spell out what the Working Group deems essential pre-conditions for the establishment of the 4 C's Initiative. The elements, in turn, set forth the minimal structural requirements that the Working Group deems necessary to make the initiative credible, productive and successful.

At the instruction of the Assistant Secretary of Land and Minerals Management, the Working Group reviewed and considered the principles and elements of the framework on federal lands governance proposed by Matthew McKinney for pilot implementation (see Attachment One – **4 C's Tools: Overview and Summary**, Appendix II). The principles promulgated by the Working Group are similar to those identified by McKinney; the framework elements recommended by the Working Group, however, differ (though the topic headings used by McKinney in his review of framework elements are partly replicated in this report). The differences between the two reflect the Working Group's contrasting recommendations for advancing a 4 C's Initiative:

- The initiative should be developed using existing BLM authority; new Congressional authority is not needed at this time. Moreover, reliance on existing planning and management authority, exercised in accordance with NEPA procedures, removes the need for new or special rules on protests and appeals or inclusion of special considerations of protests and appeals in the 4 C's Projects Program.
- The initiative should be designed and directed for agency-wide implementation and institutionalization of the 4 C's; experimentation and pilot testing are not necessary given the existing administrative authority available to the BLM for the 4 C's Initiative and the guiding framework of the President's new environmentalism and the Secretary's 4 C's agenda. The 4 C's are already happening within the agency; the task is to make the 4 C's more persuasive and pervasive within the agency and, ultimately, business as usual.
- The initiative should be local, not national, in its implementation. Oversight and project selection should be performed at the appropriate geographic scale and administrative level (e.g., Field Office).

In light of these considerations, the Working Group recommends that the following principles and elements inform the working framework for the 4 C's Initiative.

### Recommended Principles for Enhancing the 4 C's Initiative

**PRINCIPAL ONE:** *The 4 C's Initiative will be structured and advanced within existing Congressional authority; no additional implementing authority should be sought from Congress until the need for such authority has been established.*

**PRINCIPLE TWO:** *The 4 C's Initiative will not be an experimental/pilot demonstration program. Its purpose is to advance understanding, full acceptance, implementation, documentation and institutionalization of the 4 C's within the BLM, its staff and its operating culture through 4 C's projects, 4 C's information on available 4 C's tools and appropriate models (provided by projects and lessons learned), and 4 C's capacity building among agency staff, communities and interested public.*

**PRINCIPAL THREE:** *The 4 C's Initiative will be fully and seamlessly integrated within the Bureau's administration to ensure continuity in ongoing 4 C's innovation, to facilitate planned or proposed 4 C's projects and innovation, and to help field managers more readily aspire to and reach new and higher levels of community stewardship.*

**PRINCIPLE FOUR:** *The 4 C's Initiative will be fully transparent to the public in all aspects of its operations.*

**PRINCIPLE FIVE:** *The 4 C's Initiative will be subject to monitoring and public participation in oversight and reporting to further ensure transparency and to communicate credibly to stakeholders the program's record of performance.*

**PRINCIPLE SIX:** *The mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative are enduring, but the formal organization and function of the 4 C's Initiative, consistent with its mission to institutionalize the 4 C's within the agency, will not be permanent; it will have a longevity of no longer than 3-5 years, reversible only if performance and outcome indicators call for continuance of the initiative to complete its stated purpose.*

**PRINCIPLE SEVEN:** *The 4 C's Initiative will be inclusive, bottom-up and place-based in its operation, activities, and actions; citizen participation in planning will begin at the outset of the process and continue in each step thereafter; projects will be developed by the broadest possible spectrum of citizen involvement, yet defined, structured and implemented by working partnerships between communities of interest and place and the affected BLM field offices.*

**PRINCIPLE EIGHT:** *To illustrate the flexibility and universality of the 4 C's approach, and to advance the new environmentalism and the 4 C's agenda, the 4 C's Initiative will encourage and support projects across the widest possible spectrum of public land users, issues, geographic areas, applications of 4 C's tools, and combinations of*

***administrative jurisdictions that most consistently and substantially contribute to the outcome of full community stewardship of public lands.***

## Recommended Considerations for Enhancing the 4 C's Initiative

The 4 C's Initiative is designed to disseminate information, establish tools and training, and implement hands-on management for the shared stewardship of America's public lands through community problem solving and action. The 4 C's Initiative strives to move agency, citizen, and community cultures to a coordinated stewardship ethic. The following considerations help identify and frame 4 C's efforts.

### *(1) Project Development Considerations*

- Projects should be developed bottom-up by citizen and/or community groups in partnership with BLM field offices; in all instances, a partnership must be established and in effect between a BLM field office and citizen/community groups and other, if any, participating parties, before a project is eligible for support within the 4 C's Initiative.
- Projects should be developed on a foundation of broad and inclusive community representation and participation (in general, representation and participation is expected to be self-selecting and proportionate to the project's magnitude: landscape level projects are anticipated to enjoy broader participation; site-specific projects are anticipated to have more narrow participation).
- Project development should include a clear identification of participants and the responsibilities of each partner in the shared stewardship endeavor.
- Project development should include a consensus process among partners to clearly identify and define (a) desired project outcomes and (b) measurable indicators and benchmarks that document degree of success in meeting interim and final project outcomes.
- Project development should incorporate and provide incentives for ongoing conservation innovation by all members of the partnership; the Department and the BLM should provide support, direction and guidance to BLM field office managers consistent with this objective.
- Project development should, to the extent appropriate, incorporate or be consistent with the principles of performance, outcome-based management.

### *(2) Project Eligibility Considerations*

- All projects proposed and implemented as partnerships between BLM field offices and citizen/community groups and other participating parties, and that are consistent with the guidelines of the selection criteria described below, are eligible for support within the 4 C's Initiative.
- Projects receiving support within the 4 C's Initiative should engage the advice, consultation and participation of Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) or a RAC sub-group at the earliest possible date and on a regular basis; as a general rule, RACs or a RAC sub-group will be the principal interface or contact point between projects and the general public, ensuring project transparency and accountability.

- Basic support for all projects served by the 4 C's Initiative will include guidance and direction in the design and implementation of projects, access to relevant 4 C's information, tools, and networks, and assistance in identifying potential funding sources; the 4 C's Coordinator (described below) will be responsible for assuring such support.
- Funding for 4 C's projects served by the initiative (whether directed to field offices or their partners) will be in accordance with existing programs and procedures established within the agency.
- Special funding, if any, that may become available to the Assistant Secretary or the Director for purposes of project support within the 4 C's Initiative should be awarded in consultation with the respective State Director for that project and the 4 C's Coordinator in consultation with the 4 C's Working Group. Potential funds that could be targeted to 4 C's efforts include Challenge Cost Share (CCS) and Cooperative Conservation Initiative (CCI) dollars. These monies would be allocated in accordance with existing procedures within the bureau.

### *(3) Project Scope*

- Scope of a project should be determined by local BLM and its citizen and community partners.
- Scope of a project should be consistent with and contribute to the mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative, including, most critically, advancement of citizen stewardship on public lands.
- Scope of a project should include use of one or more 4 C's tools as defined by or consistent with this report.
- Scope of a project should not be issue or land-use limited: any and all issues and uses on or affecting public lands are appropriate for the scope of a project.
- Scope of a project should include or contribute to landscape level planning and management or address solutions and activities applicable to development of landscape level planning and management through programmatic contributions or site-specific innovations. It is recognized that many projects will not, themselves, be on a landscape scale. Nonetheless, they should be consistent with landscape management objectives.
- Scope of a project should include or contribute to the goal of sustaining working landscapes as measured by indicators of healthy landscapes, vibrant communities and dynamic economies.<sup>2</sup>
- Scope of a project should include use of inclusive, informed and deliberative processes for decision-making.

### *(4) Administrative Considerations*

- Operate program within Interior's existing Congressional authority
- Ensure that program and its projects comply with all relevant federal laws

---

<sup>2</sup> Counties will have a major stake in the 4 C's Initiative. A major consideration in determining the proper scope of a project should be the potential contribution of projects, either directly or indirectly, to county economic growth and stability. Many of the projects highlighted in this report indicate the diverse ways the 4 C's Initiative can contribute simultaneously to the guiding mission of conservation and to the focused objective of sustaining working landscapes, so critical to county well-being.

- Revise or develop guidance, policy and rules for consistency with or support of the 4 C's Initiative as needed
- Seek additional implementation and operational authority from Congress only upon thorough evaluation of initiative performance and outcomes over a reasonable period of time and only after full and substantial documentation of legislative needs
- Identify and secure funding for the program within existing National, State and Field Office budgets
- Identify and develop non-appropriated sources of funding for 4 C's projects, including (1) self-funding and (2) private non-profit foundation support
- Maintain existing BLM 4 C's Working Group (1) in advisory capacity to the Assistant Secretary and Director, (2) for performance of principal 4 C's Initiative activities, (3) in support capacity to the 4 C's Coordinator, and (4) as a resource to individual projects
- Establish a sunset provision for the 4 C's Initiative effective no more than 3-5 years from its start (see principles above)
- Establish 4 C's term-appointed Coordinator position in BLM on a term assignment for duration of the initiative; Coordinator duties include but are not limited to:<sup>3</sup>
  - a. Complete strategic plan for 4 C's Initiative; communicate, cooperate and consult in preparation of plan with broad range of public land users, community groups, community support organizations, the National Association of Counties, and the Western Governor's Association.
  - b. Foster and facilitate and make recommendations to the Director on training opportunities to advance 4 C's skills among bureau personnel.
  - c. Coordinate and assist process for identification, development and selection of projects; initiate outreach to field offices and potential partners to inform those parties of the initiative and its services and to foster general interest in 4 C's projects design, participation and partnership formation.
  - d. Act as a clearinghouse and source of guidance, support and information to 4 C's projects in the field.
  - e. Provide project funding recommendations to the Assistant Secretary and Director when appropriate and provide guidance to project partnerships on potential federal and non-federal sources of funding.
  - f. Coordinate project evaluation and reporting.
  - g. Ensure coordination and integration, where appropriate, with other BLM and Departmental 4 C's efforts, including MIT 4 C's Team, Best Management Practices, Business Planning, Partnership Team, Collaborative Planning, Service First Steering Committee, ADR Collaboration Group, Partnership Series, cooperating partners, and other state and federal agencies; 4 C's Initiative should provide operational support for and integration of all BLM-based 4 C's activities. 4 C's Working Group should be included in this activity.
  - h. Perform 4 C's outreach services for the bureau, including conference presentations, public writings and engagement with other federal agencies for purposes of enhancing and expanding 4 C's applications. These services should be coordinated with similar Departmental activities.

---

<sup>3</sup> A draft 3-year work plan for the proposed coordinator position was developed by Richard Whitley, member of the 4 C's Working Group and tasked to the Assistant Secretary, L&M, from 2/03 to 5/03 for the purpose of assisting in the development of the 4 C's Initiative. The draft work plan is presented in Attachment Three of this report.

- i.* Evaluate administrative tools, options and BMPs that foster agency implementation of the 4 C's and contribute to BLM performance and responsiveness to public; identify 4 C's tools and BMPs for implementation bureau-wide and other tools and BMPs that are situation-specific.
- j.* Coordinate with 4 C's issue groups that may be established by the Director to address and overcome real and potential barriers to success of the 4 C's Initiative (e.g., procurement and contracting, policy and regulatory authorities, budget processes, human capital development – knowledge, skills and abilities, and policy and guidance development for consensus-based and adaptive, outcome-based management).
- k.* Develop net-based and other networking mechanisms to share and disseminate 4 C's information.
- l.* Develop written instructional and guidance materials for 4 C's implementation in the field.
- m.* Provide or coordinate mentoring services to Field Managers and partners seeking assistance in the development of 4 C's projects or activities
- n.* Coordinate with temporary staff (e.g, 4 C's Working Group members) tasked to the 4 C's Initiative for special assignments.
- o.* Develop a list of willing 4 C's coaches and mentors within the bureau and facilitate and coordinate mentoring activities between them and Field Managers who may request such services.
- p.* Continue as an ex-officio member of 4 C's Working Group.
- Operate the 4 C's Initiative from a *virtual, adaptive and flexible* organizational format with the following administrative characteristics:
  - a.* Initiative is fully integrated within the bureau: it is not distinguishable or separable as a unique directorate or bureaucracy; it lacks a physical office or discrete location; structurally invisible, it is wherever the 4 C's are practiced.
  - b.* Initiative has no fixed staff apart from the detail of the 4 C's Coordinator.
  - c.* Temporary or detailed staff to the 4 C's Initiative will come from any units of the organization and will be inclusive of all programs and administrative units that structure the BLM (enhancing mission of 4 C's institutionalization).
  - d.* Initiative will have no traditional administrative portfolio that might otherwise overlap with or interfere with existing bureau structures; its function is to serve, not compete with, and support, not supplant, the existing management configuration of the BLM.
  - e.* Initiative will not compete with WO and states for budget; operational dollars for the Initiative will be proportionate to the emphasis each WO program, state and field office voluntary places on advancement of the 4 C's.

## (5) Advisory Components

- Resource Advisory Councils, or designated sub-groups, should be used as primary FACA institutions for providing public input into and public oversight of 4 C's projects within their respective jurisdictions.
- 4 C's Working Group should provide on a request basis advice and assistance in project development and implementation.
- 4 C's Coordinator should coordinate and participate in the evaluation and assessment of projects and report findings to the Director.

- 4 C's Working Group should provide support to the Coordinator in project evaluation, assessment and reporting.

(6) **Project Monitoring** – Monitoring is essential to the success of the 4 C's Initiative. It is intended to (a) inform and direct partners and their project activities toward desired outcomes, (b) provide credibility and transparency to the program, (c) enrich the tool box of available 4 C's tools, (d) expand our understanding of what tools work or do not work, when and where; (e) determine whether a project should continue to be supported by the initiative (however that support is defined) and (f) provide information from which to adjust activities to ensure achievement of desired outcomes. Elements of project monitoring framework include:

- Programmatic, planning and plan implementation projects will regularly be monitored and reported based on the performance standards, interim indicators and benchmarks agreed upon by the partners to measure progress toward outcomes.
- Projects served by the initiative and receiving financial support that is facilitated by or provided through the initiative will submit performance reports to the Coordinator at mutually agreed-upon intervals; all other projects will be encouraged to voluntarily submit to the Coordinator reports detailing 4 C's applications, tools, barriers and outcomes for inclusion in the 4 C's network data base. [Director should issue an instruction memorandum requesting appropriate reporting by partners to Coordinator to ensure integrity and maximum utility of a 4 C's data base.]
- Continued support for projects by the 4 C's Initiative will be contingent on monitoring results that (1) integrate with and enhance management; (2) confirm project progress toward outcomes; or (3) redirect project efforts on a track consistent with reaching desired outcomes.
- The Coordinator, with assistance from the 4 C's Working Group, shall (1) review all performance reports for projects receiving initiative funding, or facilitated funding, and report to the Assistant Secretary and Director on the status of those projects and (2) review monitoring and informational reports voluntarily submitted from all other 4 C's projects and incorporate relevant 4 C's findings, applications, lessons and models into the 4 C's network data base for access and use by field managers and other partners.
- RACs and other advisory/oversight entities that may be established should have access to performance reports and associated monitoring data, and may, as appropriate, provide recommendations to the State Director for the continuation or termination of program support for individual projects. The State Directors will make recommendations to the Coordinator. [Assistant Secretary and Director shall be notified of recommendations to terminate project support.]
- Project participants will meet annually within regions or nationally through agency satellite communication facilities to exchange ideas, document lessons learned, and identify what works, what doesn't work, and why; alternatively, participants will report the same information through their RACs in national RAC meetings. The latter option may be more efficient and preferable in terms of public information and transparency.

(7) **Departmental Participation** – Consistent with the bottom-up, self-determining character of the 4 C's Initiative, the Department's role in the bureau effort should be limited to

provision of assistance and support when requested by project partners. That assistance and support includes:

- Departmental support for inter-agency cooperation and data/information sharing
- Departmental support for removal of barriers impeding 4 C's implementation
- Departmental support for improving NEPA procedural requirements in conformance with NEPA intent and consistent with the 4 C's (including support for reciprocal actions by CEQ)
- Departmental revision of all relevant elements in its manual for consistency with the 4 C's and the 4 C's Initiative
- Departmental support for 4 C's innovation in the implementation of the ESA and other environmental requirements in project areas
- Continuous Solicitor support for the 4 C's Initiative at the Washington level to:
  - a. Review 4 C's projects for procedural sufficiency
  - b. Review 4 C's projects for consistency with non-delegation rule
  - c. Provide legal assistance to Coordinator regarding 4 C's Initiative and its projects and activities
  - d. Engage Departmental assistance in FACA interpretation and application as it relates to operation of the 4 C's Initiative

#### IV. BARRIERS AND SOLUTIONS TO SUCCESS OF THE 4 C's INITIATIVE

The long-term success of the 4 C's Initiative is contingent on addressing major barriers to its implementation. Those barriers are both internal and external to the agency's daily operational environment. Internal barriers that potentially threaten the ultimate success of the 4 C's Initiative are those best characterized as cultural in origin. They are the institutional roadblocks that have been erected over the years as staff and agency have pursued traditional means of planning for and managing the resources mandated to their care and oversight. The cultural barrier is multifaceted. It may include (1) managers and staff unaware or unsure of how to proceed with shared stewardship and collaborative management; (2) training and skill deficiencies that impede effective cooperation, communication and consultation with potential partners; and (3) the establishment of working relationships with communities and the fostering and directing of public participation in distinctly 4 C's directions.

External barriers to the 4 C's Initiative are those that lie beyond the immediate control of the agency or the field office responsible for implementing the projects that are the content and purpose of the initiative. They result from the social, political, legal and institutional environment in which the agency and/or its managers find themselves. Communities can pose significant barriers to 4 C's activities and actions when community members lack the skills, knowledge and understanding to effectively partner with the BLM in 4 C's projects. An array of administrative and process-laden requirements in law and regulation also act as barriers when they transform public participation into procedural gridlock and an unending stream of protests, challenges, appeals and litigation.

Budgetary, financial and procurement and contracting barriers also exist. They can be determining factors in what agency and staff can or cannot do in regards to advancement of the 4 C's Initiative. Informational barriers are significant too. Inadequate or inaccessible information regarding the 4 C's and proposed and ongoing shared stewardship projects is perhaps the single greatest barrier. The barriers of culture, community, process, management, budget/finance, information and support are discussed in detail, below. In each section, solutions that address the respective barriers are also discussed and specific recommendations offered to the Assistant Secretary.

#### **Cultural Barriers to Advancement and Success of the 4 C's Initiative – Barriers internal to the operation of the BLM that potentially obstruct or impede.**

##### *(1) Attitudinal Barriers – Barriers to the 4 C's Initiative that reside in the customs, values and expectations of agency staff and managers, including:*

- **Blinders Barrier** – BLM takes justifiable pride in its ability to work with communities. That ability has resulted in a conviction that “we are already doing collaborative work with communities.” And indeed they are to varying degrees. Many communities today, however, are seeking an increasing role in the management of public lands. Despite the BLM's long history of working with communities, in some areas the Bureau's approach to working with communities has not substantially changed. Along the continuum of 4 C's possibilities, its practices have not, as a rule, made substantive progress toward realizing full participation by the community in stewardship of public lands. To date, most of

the agency's work with communities centers on formal community leadership and formal community organizations. Two new areas of community engagement have come to the forefront in recent years: one is identifying the informal leadership and networks in the community and the other is identifying the social and cultural boundaries of the community. These new and critical paths of engagement with communities need exploration and refinement.

- [Inertia Barrier](#) – The BLM planning and critical decision-making model (a) provides information to the community, (b) gets the community's input, (c) interprets and evaluates information in the office environment (e.g., generating alternatives in the NEPA process) and (d) issues the agency's final decision. In effect, the community is uninvolved in the most substantive aspects of public land management: goal setting, problem-solving, decision-making and implementation of the decisions. This is antithetical to the 4 C's mission of shared partnerships and the 4 C's goal of citizen conservation and community stewardship.
- [Rigidly Held Views Barrier](#) – Organizations tend to develop their own institutional communities. This is particularly true of governmental organizations whose processes have traditionally kept them segregated. BLM is no exception. The BLM institutional community may create institutional and cultural "boundaries," reinforced by administrative boundaries unique to the agency's mission. The issue is how BLM recognizes and counters the adverse impacts such boundaries may precipitate.

### Recommendations:

- BLM should recognize the success it has had working with communities in the past and build from that success to adapt its understanding of community and its community outreach efforts to the changing structure, meaning and function of community in the New West.
- BLM should provide information and training agency-wide on methods for identifying informal community leaders and for identifying social and cultural boundaries of communities.
- BLM should work toward engaging communities at the outset in all aspects of goal setting, problem solving, decision-making and decision implementation.
- BLM should encourage and prepare line officers and staff to fully engage in community issues, many of which are not limited to public lands (e.g., a BLM fire crew might paint the town's tourist center); fuller engagement fosters awareness and understanding of local community.
- BLM should more broadly apply such tools as Alternative Dispute Resolution and similar practices when community issues are not resolved through standard collaborative means.

- BLM should provide clear guidance and direction from its leadership to field officers and staff that working across administrative boundaries (both with other agency field offices and non-agency entities) is an institutional priority.
- BLM should encourage and recognize broader community participation by line officers and staff, acknowledging that communities of place are defined by cultural attachments to landscapes, not institutions.

(2) *Training Barriers – Barriers to the 4 C's Initiative arising from personnel training; specifically, work expectations created by traditional training and limitations in skill development associated with a disproportionately technical training.*

- Work Expectation Barrier – In general, BLM field staff is trained to manage resources, not people. In fact, this is precisely why many employees choose agency employment: they want the experience and the fulfillment of working on and managing natural resources. As a result, there is an inherent predilection among staff *to do work* rather than *manage work*. Given the magnitude of today's resource issues and challenges and the paucity of federal resources to meet them, the “do it alone” expectation is not sustainable. It places an enormous and often unattainable burden on staff to do the impossible. More to the point, it is counter-productive. It fails to consider the contributions shared stewardship can make toward natural resource health and conservation.
- Skill Barrier – Traditionally BLM's workforce has been hired for its scientific and/or technical expertise. Over the last several years BLM has recognized the value added of collaborative management skills. BLM recognizes, however, that it needs to expand and develop these skills among all employees for true collaboration with communities to grow.

**Recommendations:**

- BLM should train and prepare staff to actively use and apply community skills in land management rather than simply increasing field office staff and staff workloads.
- BLM needs to emphasize that an essential part of the agency's natural resource management mission is to build new partnerships and foster community involvement in the shared stewardship of public lands. This message is consistent with the reality of smaller budgets and a smaller work force.
- BLM should measure success not in institutional terms – what BLM has done alone – but in the context of how successful the agency has been in establishing partnerships and what those partnerships have accomplished.
- BLM should work with colleges and universities to encourage them to make the history and legal basis of natural resource management, negotiation, mediation, collaboration, conflict resolution and related community skills part of the core undergraduate natural resource curriculum.

- BLM should provide or make available to current field managers and staff training in community outreach and collaborative skills through expanded use of the partnership series and similar learning opportunities.
- BLM should support development of cultural awareness training as part of community outreach and collaborative skill building.

*(3) Situational Barriers -- Barriers to the 4 C's Initiative arising from institutional and personnel factors.*

- Collaboration Barrier – Collaboration is founded on relationships of trust and familiarity. Sound relationships require time to develop. Changes in BLM managers, local government officials, tribal officials and community leaders may result in discontinuities in agency support for community-based efforts.
- Support Barrier: Field Office – Current reporting systems do not recognize the time and commitment required to form effective collaborations.
- Community Service Barrier – Gaps in civic skills include not understanding how local, county and state governments function and how local procedures such as laws and regulations, regional planning, and local networks function and interface. Lacking these civic skills and information, BLM staff are unable to effectively reach out to local communities and, more importantly, unable to build requisite collaborative partnerships and promote citizen stewardship.
- Community Awareness Barrier – Absent an understanding of community needs, wants and desires. In the absence of such information, BLM cannot effectively forge meaningful partnerships or foster local participation in planning and management of public lands.
- Conflict of Interest Barrier – Many BLM staff fear that working with local communities entails a conflict of interest or violates the agency's Trust obligation
- Civic Participation Barrier – Many BLM staff are uncertain on the federal rules regarding the legality and/or propriety of their formal participation in civic activities, including membership on local governmental boards and committees. Lack of clarification on what they are allowed to do, or proscribed from doing, discourages civic participation that is otherwise permissible..

**Recommendations:**

- The Department and the BLM should engage in an aggressive outreach to all agency personnel regarding the 4 C's and the 4 C's Initiative.
- BLM should ensure that all Field Offices have staff engaged in or aware of community issues, relationships and operations.

- BLM should consider creation of community liaisons within some or all Field Offices, either as separate positions or as duties appended to an existing position.
- BLM should include collaborative and community outreach experience and/or training in the position descriptions required of staff in general and line officers in particular. This includes:
  - Knowledge that collaboration is a BLM priority
  - Collaboration skills
  - Civic skills
  - Conflict resolution skills
- BLM selection practices and procedures for choosing Field Managers and State Directors should emphasize or include in the core requirements mandated for those positions the Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (KSAs) that include the collaborative and community-based elements and other pertinent 4 C's skills described above.
- The Department and agency should provide guidance and direction in formulating a more comprehensive and integrated working definition of community that is consistent with the Secretary's 4 C's policy.
- BLM should include community-outreach, collaboration, and shared partnering activities and successes in the performance measures and evaluations of line officers at Field Office and State level.
- The agency should engage more aggressive, thorough and comprehensive use of post-graduate training options to inculcate community, collaborative and partnering core skills in BLM managers and staff, including:
  - BLM National Training Center Partnership Series
  - NGO programs (e.g., Sonoran Institute community training)
  - Regional and national meetings of line officers at the Field Manager level and above (e.g., Shepardstown, W.Va. and BLM NTC training facilities).
  - National Association of Counties (training and assistance in how local governments functions)
  - Western Governors Association (training and assistance in how state governments work)
- BLM should address the advantages of longer rotation periods for field managers to allow time to correctly forge collaborative relationships.
- BLM should designate a Special Assistant at the Washington Office (WO) to coordinate and support state and local training initiatives and community-outreach needs and concerns.
- BLM should take actions to (1) increase public and community awareness and knowledge of the 4 C's Initiative and (2) increase agency staff awareness and knowledge of how collaborative activities can build more positive community relations,

improve resource management accomplishments, and reduce sources of conflict and vulnerability to otherwise avoidable protests and appeals.

- State Offices should designate community-based experts/consultants on State Office (SO) staff to work with Field Offices in implementation of community outreach, collaboration and partnering.
- BLM WO and SO should institute formal recognition and reward incentives for 4 C's practitioners in the field, including an annual community collaboration/partnership award (perhaps for both agency staff and non-agency partners).
- BLM should provide parallel training on and exposure to community-based skills to RACs and relevant RAC sub-group members.
- BLM should coordinate with land grant colleges and other universities with natural resource programs to institute community and collaborative management and conflict resolution skills training in undergraduate curriculum. Possible models include the CISPUS program at the University of Washington (agency-sponsored collaborative training program for natural resource agencies) and the National Training Center Partnership Series (with expanded core curriculum).
- BLM should formally encourage and acknowledge volunteer community work by agency personnel.
- BLM should develop and provide guidance to agency staff on their formal participation in civic activities, including membership on local governmental boards and committees.

**Community Barriers to 4 C's Projects Implementation – Barriers external to the BLM that are community-based or that involve an array of stumbling blocks to effective community participation in collaborative and shared stewardship partnerships with the agency and its staff.**

*(1) Inadequate Community Resources and Capacity Barrier – Barriers related to the available resources and capacity of communities to engage in collaborative and shared stewardship partnerships.*

- Community leadership may not be aware of the 4 C's.
- Turnover in Community leadership may be high, preventing continuity in and organic development of collaborative and partnering relationships with the agency.
- Collaborative, conflict resolution and technical skills essential to effective stewardship partnerships with the agency may be absent or insufficient within community.
- Communities of place may lack experience in how best to participate in formal federal meetings and planning processes.
- Citizen involvement is voluntary and may be limited by workplace demands and dollar costs of participation (travel, food, lodging, etc.)

- Community leaders and members lack adequate understanding of how federal agencies work, the legal and procedural requirements they must follow, and the general policies, regulations and laws that determine public land use.

*(2) Conflicting Community Values Barrier – Barriers related to differences between formal agency operations and informal community functions, perceptions and beliefs.*

- Communities may view public lands as “theirs” and resist participation in collaborative or shared stewardship partnerships.
- Community life is informal, subject to day-to-day living activities and casual gatherings among family and friends at churches, in restaurants, at post offices, at associational meetings, and in stores and shopping malls. These informal patterns of living conflict with and are sometimes incompatible with the formal processes of federal agencies. For example, normal life routines may prevent attendance and participation in formal agency activities.
- Much of community life is built on social capital – e.g., goodwill and informal networks and associations generated within the community by voluntary citizen giving and participation. Although an essential asset in community life, it is not accounted for in formal BLM processes that focus on procedure or consider only the natural components of managed landscapes. Desirable and durable management outcomes require consideration of the human element and its functional role in landscape stewardship – *the foundation for economically and environmentally sustainable working landscapes.*

**Recommendations:**

- BLM should more fully utilize existing resources (i.e., NTC Partnership Series, NACo, Sonoran Institute) to promote 4 C’s capacity development and federal procedural training within communities.
- BLM should develop and/or encourage opportunities for shared capacity development between agency staff and community leaders whenever possible.
- BLM should encourage curriculum development in collaborative management at both the high school and college level within the service areas of public land-based communities.
- Numerous organizations have researched issues of community barriers and have developed processes to effectively engage communities in public land management; BLM (potentially through the 4 C’s Coordinator and training/workshops) should make this information available to agency field managers, staff and the community.
- Both the Department and the BLM should expand outreach activities to public land communities on the meaning and opportunities of the Secretary’s 4 C’s agenda.
- BLM field managers and staff should adapt, to the extent possible, their formal operations and processes to the more informal ways that communities do business; clear direction and guidance should be provided to local offices by BLM WO and SO.

- BLM formal operations and processes at the field office level should be consistent with the goal of sustainable working landscapes; BLM should develop appropriate guidance and direction at the WO and SO levels to help attain this goal.

**Administrative Barriers to Advancement and Success of the 4 C's Initiative – External barriers to citizen-based collaboration and partnered stewardship on public lands that arise from perceived or real procedural and administrative requirements, regulatory or statutory obstacles and conflict generated by threatened or existing protests, appeals and litigation – all of which are inconsistent with or detrimental to the mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative.**

**(1) Process and Regulatory Barriers – Barriers arising from administrative procedures and requirements which block, impede or unnecessarily complicate hands-on collaborative partnerships and citizen-based stewardship activities on public lands.**

- Procedural requirements that prohibit timely resolution of issues that may otherwise be integral to the creation and continuance of collaborative partnerships.
- Agency-imposed time constraints on planning processes; mitigates against collaborative or consensus-based planning which may require more time than traditional, top-down planning methods; restricts public involvement and engagement in public land stewardship.
- Agency administrative procedures may adversely affect implementation of the 4 C's Initiative
  - Inadequate understanding of procurement and agreement requirements may hinder or prevent formation of collaborative and stewardship-based partnerships
  - Inadequate understanding of 4 C's tools and their uses (see Attachment: 4 C's Tools – Overview and Summary)
  - Inadequate understanding of current GSA FACA Guidelines.
- Administrative constraints under NEPA, the Endangered Species Act and other guiding legislation that are inconsistent with the 4 C's and/or depart from the intent of the original legislation and, as a result, interfere with or prevent effective partnering between the BLM and community and citizen groups
- Policies, rules and/or laws that restrict or constrain collaborative activity between BLM and citizen/community partners or limit the participation of citizen/community partners in the planning and management of public lands [ *(2) Conflict Resolution Barriers – Barriers arising from inappropriate or improper application of conflict resolution tactics and tools.*
- Individuals and groups seeking resolution to conflict by circumventing accepted processes and procedures and seeking political resolution at state or national decision-making levels that circumvent local BLM Field Offices and their community partners; lobbying activities that entail end-runs around collaborative processes.
- Focus on crisis management rather than long-term problem-solving; conducive to perpetuation of conflict since symptoms of conflict, not causes of conflict, are addressed.

- Inadequate understanding and/or improper application of ADR and other conflict resolution tools; when is ADR appropriate and when are other 4 C's options preferable?

### Recommendations:

- Review bureau memorandums of instruction, rules and regulations and other guidance to determine consistency with 4 C's and 4 C's Initiative and identify changes to expedite 4 C's and 4 C's Initiative [Note: May be appropriate task for 4 C's Coordinator in conjunction with 4 C's Working Group.]
- Director issue memorandums of instruction to clarify and address inconsistencies that currently exist between agency policy and the 4 C's.
- Consider and adopt rule changes in basic BLM programs to facilitate 4 C's Initiative Implementation
- Identify opportunities in existing legislation to further develop, enhance and advance policy and guidance for 4 C's applications; identify legislative elements inconsistent with 4 C's applications and propose corrective measures.
- Department and BLM should update guidance and direction for the interpretation and application of recent GSA FACA guidelines.
- Department and BLM, in coordination with CEQ, should seek appropriate improvements of NEPA procedures in their respective manuals consistent with the intent of NEPA and consistent with the goals and objectives of the 4 C's, collaborative stewardship partnerships, advancement of community stewardship and the administrative tools essential to the 4 C's Initiative.
- Department and BLM should consider options for addressing social and cultural impacts resulting from federal actions in a manner consistent with NEPA documentation of resource impacts and as mandated under NEPA to assess and mitigate significant impacts on the human environment.
- Address rules and laws that prevent the BLM from working across administrative boundaries.
- BLM should emphasize and reinforce the centrality of partnerships in the 4 C's Initiative and the need for all parties – federal and non-federal – to work within the context of those partnerships to achieve their conservation and participatory objectives. Parties to a collaboration that seek advantage or support from higher levels within the agency or the Department should be instructed to work within the partnership to resolve outstanding issues.
- BLM should provide appropriate training and guidance in the use of conflict resolution, including Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). ADR and other conflict resolution models are simply *tools* to assist in reaching the goals and objectives of the Secretary's 4 C's agenda and the 4 C's Initiative. Ideally, the proper use and application of other 4

C's tools (described in Attachment: *4 C's Tools – Overview and Summary*) should reduce or eliminate dispute and conflict by expanding access to public lands through an array of collaborative partnerships and hands-on stewardship opportunities.

**Management Barriers to Advancement and Success of the 4 C's Initiative – Barriers to the advancement and success of the 4 C's Initiative that result from gaps, deficiencies or disincentives in accountability and performance measures for agency managers.**

**Performance Barrier**

BLM managers are held accountable for, and their performance is measured by, specific and concrete outputs they produce -- not for progress they make toward or actual attainment of strategic outcomes, such as those circumscribed by the 4 C's. Moreover, the structure of their work and the signals they receive externally persuade managers to focus principally on overcoming problems. Tracking progress made toward strategic 4 C's goals and adapting management to stay on track are relegated to secondary or tertiary consideration.

Performance evaluation under the agency's current management system does not adequately account for or provide incentives toward 4 C's outcomes. Career advancement is not directly tied to staff participation in and support for community-based and landscape management goals. Managers are judged and their management budgets are predicated on production of measurable and concrete products, such as completion of a plan or numbers of acres treated or otherwise managed. But neither completion of a plan nor numbers of acres treated have a necessary connection to 4 C's conservation outcomes, whether framed in terms of healthy landscapes or expanded public access to participation in the management and determination of healthy landscapes. Four C's processes and outcomes are often secondary when judged by current management standards.

For example, community-based planning can be both more expensive and more time-consuming *upfront* than conventional top-down planning. As such, it is not a consistently desirable output – despite the policy emphasis given the 4 C's in the Department and in the bureau. Managers who pursue time consuming collaborative activities and partnership formations will not necessarily be rewarded with acknowledgement, recognition or career advancement.

The upfront costs of collaboration may be high, but the long-term savings in reduced litigation, successful plan implementation and carry-through, leveraged resources (through shared partnerships) and the goodwill that collaboration breeds are far greater.

Defining and measuring outputs in a manner consistent with and supportive of the 4 C's and the 4 C's Initiative is the challenge. The 2003 draft GPRA strategic plan incorporates partnership goals and landscape outcome measures. Manager performance goals are now being linked to these outcomes. Prior to their implementation, managers lacked incentives to implement the 4 C's and participate fully in efforts such as the 4 C's Initiative. Apart from a minority of innovators, most managers saw no compelling reason to engage in or to take extraordinary steps to promote collaborative activities that were not formally recognized by the agency in its management accounting system.

### Recommendations:

- Department and BLM should apply 4 C's to internal management; there should be consistency between what the bureau practices internally vis-à-vis its managers and what it practices externally vis-à-vis the public and citizen participation in the management of public lands. The first steps toward building this consistency have been taken in the 2003 draft GPRA Strategic Plan and the Department's Human Resource Strategic Plan.
- Performance elements and measures for managers need to be based on outcomes as well as OPM core competencies.
- BLM must develop performance elements and measures that correspond to 4 C's outcomes, including collaboration, conflict resolution, stewardship partnerships and leveraged resources, sustainable and meaningful public participation in public land management, successful plan implementation, sustainable working landscapes, and reduction in conflict, polarization and litigation.
- BLM should establish benchmarks for 4 C's performance elements and measures.
- Accommodation should be made and encouragement provided for innovators and risk takers who advance the 4 C's and the 4 C's Initiative beyond the boundaries of current or future management performance elements. This includes:
  - Flexibility for managers to expand timelines for community processes assuming progress is currently being made
  - Institutional support for risk taking
  - No external intrusion by the agency or the Department in partnerships that are working
  - Shared-accountability for community decision-making and partnerships that fail [Managers should not be held exclusively accountable for partnerships that fail if those partnerships were genuine and broadly supported – nor should they be held accountable if partnerships are undermined by outside intervention.]
- BLM should establish an annual recognition award and/or bonus for managers who exhibit greatest innovation and success in the application of the 4 C's and the advancement of the 4 C's Initiative.

### Recommendation

In addition to the recommendations provided under cultural and training barriers, the BLM should update knowledge, skills and abilities required of Field Managers to include and emphasize: skills in negotiation, mediation, facilitation and core competencies in such areas as teamwork, community leadership and service, state and local government and politics, collaborative techniques, and community-based conservation.

**Budgetary, Financial and Procurement and Contracting Barriers to Full and Proper Implementation of the 4 C's Initiative – Constraints that potentially affect or limit the ability of the agency and/or local field managers to marshal and direct resources to project implementation and to other facets of the 4 C's Initiative. These include:**

- National communities of interest – *organized special interests* – may seem to have a disproportionate impact by virtue of their organization, focused outreach and professional leadership. In contrast, communities of place lack skills and resources to play a commensurate role in agenda and budget setting. This potentially skews the distribution of resources and the degree of commitment the agency may have for 4 C's initiatives – initiatives that otherwise require equal inclusion and participation of both communities of interest and place.
- Congressional funding at the sub-activity rather than activity level removes discretion of local field offices and restricts flexibility in use of funds, particularly in regard to 4 C's initiatives that may depend upon flexibility, discretion, risk-taking and innovation.
- Authority for multi-year funding is not available to the BLM. This could compromise 4 C's efforts whose outcome horizons – *sustainable working landscapes* – tend to extend beyond those of other projects. This may adversely affect funding allocation decisions or inject uncertainty in the implementation of 4 C's projects.
- Funding cycles do not always occur in tandem with or correspond to emergent opportunities for 4 C's activities. For example, potential partners may have funding in hand for collaborative initiatives, opportunistic partnerships, and time-sensitive projects, but BLM may be unable to take advantage of such opportunities for lack of matching funds.
- BLM lacks grant authority, and has not effectively used grant availability except on a very limited basis (i.e., the Sikes Act). This limits the range of support BLM can provide to 4 C's initiatives.
- The Challenge Cost-Share Program is a potential source of funding for 4 C's activities in general and the 4 C's Initiative in particular. Guidelines did not exist in the past that would have given allocation priority to 4 C's activities and projects. Guidance is now being prepared to ensure the program is consistent with the Secretary's 4 C's.
- Alternative, non-appropriated funding sources have not been identified or developed for the 4 C's Initiative. The effectiveness of the program will depend, in part, on the availability of such funding.
- Open space conservation is a challenge to the 4 C's and the 4 C's Initiative. Policy guidelines and budget limit the agency's ability to augment its public land portfolio through further acquisitions.
- Available funding restricts the ability of the agency to rationalize land ownership consistent with federal and local land-use planning and the mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative.

- BLM's 18 percent administrative surcharge on outside funding sources may discourage contributions from partners or prevent or compromise the formation of effective stewardship partnerships.
- Contracting and Procurement (C&P) staff and procedures may pose a potential barrier to implementation of 4 C's projects dependent on assistance agreements, contracts and other devices for transfer of agency funds. Frequently, C&P employees lack familiarity with the 4 C's. They are not trained in or prepared to deal with collaborative partnership arrangements and the unique requirements those partnerships may demand. They are generally not familiar with the broad array of administrative options available to such projects or the procedural flexibility that may be required for those projects to happen. The culture of C&P staff is strongly embedded in traditional contracting and procurement, often unprepared to respond innovatively and positively to partnership arrangements and requirements that may otherwise clash with how business has been done in the past. Moreover, the traditional procedures used by C&P staff may not be well suited to the special circumstances of many citizen-based partnerships. Process delays, for example, may stall or discourage local collaborations. In addition, many C&P rules and policies are not designed to accommodate the proliferation of 4 C's partnerships that are now occurring. Those rules and policies are barriers to building a strong 4 C's Initiative that can effectively address community stewardship in the future.

### Recommendations:

- BLM should address the imbalance between communities of place and interest by amending the rules for and charters of Resource Advisory Councils to provide opportunities for local RACs to be briefed on and to give input and advice into agency budget and associated agenda priorities.
- The Washington Office and State Offices should provide analysis of grant availability and guidance and assistance on the appropriate application of grants to encourage their use at the field office level.
- Invite communities to participate in promulgation of field office annual work plans. This will allow BLM and the community to better coordinate their respective activities and to be better prepared to take advantage of windows of opportunity to advance the 4 C's and the 4 C's Initiative.
- The Department is coordinating development of cooperative conservation challenge cost share guidance for its three land managing agencies. BLM should develop agency-specific criteria consistent with the Departmental guidance and the 4 C's Initiative mission, goal and objectives.
- The Department and the BLM should address funding issues for the Working Group and the 4 C's Coordinator as soon as possible.

- The Department and the BLM should consider non-appropriated funding options for the 4 C's Initiative, including:
  - Programs such as the Clark County Amendment authorizing public land sales in the greater Las Vegas area for land restoration and recreation activities
  - Funding mechanisms similar to the western Oregon Rural Schools Act
  - Self-funding through project participation in fee demo program
  - Partnerships with private non-profit foundations to provide funding for 4 C's projects
  - Other funding opportunities, including Congressional authorization for a community-based or citizen conservation fund financed by a percentage share from one or more public land revenue streams
- BLM should further exercise its realty authority to buy, sell and exchange lands so as to complement and advance local and state planning efforts as well as open space initiatives, consistent with the 4 C's mission, goal and objectives.
- BLM should waive the 18 percent surcharge on outside contributions to projects within the 4 C's Initiative and related 4 C's activities.
- The Department and the BLM should address liability concerns of agency staff in regard to participate in 4 C's activities and projects.
- Contracts and term hires should be done prudently and strategically, consistent with the mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative.
- Contracting and Procurement staff should be provided training opportunities in collaborative techniques and partnerships, with emphasis on new tools that enable those relationships and the special circumstances and requirements that may attend issuance of assistance agreements, contracts and other funding and payment devices.
- Performance elements and outcome measures consistent with the 4 C's and the 4 C's Initiative should be developed for Contracting and Procurement.
- Contracting and Procurement rules, policies and procedures should be assessed in light of the 4 C's and the 4 C's Initiative and amended, accordingly, for consistency with the purpose and outcome of community stewardship.

**Informational Barrier to Advancement and Success of the 4 C's Initiative – Lack of or inaccessibility to information regarding the 4 C's, their application in practice to on-the-ground projects, options for applying them under variable circumstances, barriers to their use and other information as it pertains to the purpose and support activities of the 4 C's Initiative is a primary barrier to the initiative's success and implementation of 4 C's projects. Bridging that barrier is essential to ensure maximum access to needed information by agency managers, partners and interested public – and to avoid the costly and inefficient duplication of reinventing existing tools and applications, repeating lessons already learned and discarded, and perpetuating failures that otherwise could be avoided.**

## Recommendations:

- 4 C's Coordinator should:
  - Develop guide to identify and apply appropriate 4 C's tools in the design and implementation of projects [Use Attachment – 4 C's Tools: Overview and Summary – as potential template]; agency and partner versions should be made available
  - Develop a guide to 4 C's barriers and tools that address those barriers.
  - Develop a field compendium of 4 C's tools and barriers for agency and partner use that is distilled to basics and that is user friendly: e.g., "Collaboration for Dummies."
  - Build a computer-based resource center for all data and information that is relevant to the 4 C's Initiative (and its successful implementation) and that is accessible to agency managers and staff; public access should be provided to data that is covered by FOIA.
  - Provide a web-based directory and map (with internet links) to 4 C's projects and 4 C's data and information
  - Provide a contact network for 4 C's consultation within the agency and for partners outside the agency
  - Include in website: (a) Guide to agreements; (b) Discussion and links on collaborative management, partnership and team creation, strategies for sustaining collaboration and partnerships, and possible chat room for agency, partner and public use.
  - Ensure that printed 4 C's information materials and website electronic access to those materials are known and accessible to all field managers, partners and interested public.
  
- 4 C's Coordinator establish a 4 C's assistance and demonstration program where (a) field managers can visit and learn from ongoing 4 C's projects at other field offices or (b) field managers with 4 C's projects in their areas visit other field offices to provide information and hands-on assistance in establishing 4 C's projects.
  
- 4 C's Coordinator with assistance from the 4 C's Working Group members perform an ongoing survey and analysis of ongoing 4 C's projects and applications of 4 C's tools to identify what projects and applications work and what projects and applications have failed, any why; analysis of "lessons learned" should be posted on 4 C's information web site. The RAC's should be charged with participating in this review and providing their evaluations to the Working Group.
  
- 4 C's Coordinator with assistance from 4 C's Working Group members should develop from 4 C's projects and applications a guide to Best management Practices.
  
- 4 C's Coordinator with assistance from 4 C's Working Group members should facilitate regional and nationwide satellite downlink discussion forums on 4 C's activities, projects and their status, and lessons learned among BLM managers and partners; option to specialized downlink is to incorporate 4 C's discussion and reporting forum in the annual RAC satellite downlink meeting.

**Support Barrier to Advancement and Success of the 4 C's Initiative – Success of the 4 C's Initiative is contingent upon broad and continuous support from within the agency and across the Department. Without strong and continuous support from, and high visibility within the Department and the BLM, the 4 C's Initiative will face significant obstacles in the acquisition of resources, development of projects and successful completion of its mission, goal and objectives.**

**Recommendations:**

- BLM Director should issue an instruction memorandum that is supportive of the 4 C's Initiative and that encourages field offices with projects consistent with the 4 C's to provide information to the 4 C's Coordinator and the Working Group.
- Office of the Secretary should provide continuous support, including
  - Ongoing visibility and exposure to communication media (Office of Communications)
    - Liaison between the program and Congress
    - Liaison between the program and state and local governments and interest groups (external and inter-governmental affairs)
    - Access to and ongoing assistance from the Solicitor and the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals

Periodic visits to 4 C's project sites by the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary (L&M and PMB)

## V. RANGE OF EXISTING AND SUGGESTED CANDIDATE 4 C's PROJECTS

BLM field offices in each of the 11 western states are engaged in a variety of 4 C's planning and management efforts. In addition, many of those field offices are considering 4 C's activities and initiatives for implementation in the near future. The Working Group examined and considered a cross-section of those current efforts and projected initiatives. The Working Group focused on projects – either those that were recently initiated at the field office and state level or those still in the conceptual and planning stages – that would be consistent with the 4 C's and the framework and criteria of the proposed 4 C's Initiative.

Twenty-three projects were identified and selected by the Working Group. They address the Assistant Secretary's request for outstanding 4 C's opportunities and candidate projects that (1) embody the principles of citizen-based conservation and community stewardship, (2) embrace the spectrum of 4 C's tools and options that are administratively available to the BLM, (3) potentially qualify for current support and/or future implementation by the bureau, and (4) demonstrate the range of innovative 4 C's efforts now underway on BLM lands that contribute to the purpose and outcome of full community stewardship of public lands. Several of the selected projects are joint initiatives involving both BLM and private sector non-profit organizations as principal partners with affected citizens, community groups, and local governments. One of the projects is an initiative put forward by a non-profit conservation organization for BLM consideration. Each of the 23 projects is discussed in various degrees of detail: greater detail for projects currently underway or under active consideration and lesser detail for projects in the conceptual stages.

It should be noted that the 23 selected projects are not intended to be exhaustive of the 4 C's activities now underway on BLM lands – or, for that matter, under consideration by BLM or potential BLM partners. More importantly, they are not presented as the full universe of candidate projects that could potentially qualify for bureau support within the context of the 4 C's Initiative. Rather, the selected projects are intended to merely indicate the range of activities that are planned, in the process of planning, or in the initial stages of implementation on BLM managed lands. In the opinion of the Working Group, the selected projects reflect the most innovative and promising 4 C's approaches to citizen and community participation in public land planning and management and 4 C's capacity and skills development. Moreover, the 23 projects are notable for the diverse ways in which they advance citizen conservation and stewardship partnerships, both on the lands that are managed by the bureau and in the daily activities of bureau staff and managers. Finally, the heavy reliance by the Working Group on 4 C's projects recommended by bureau field offices should not be interpreted as disinterest in or discouragement of private sector and citizen-based proposals. Citizen initiation of 4 C's projects will predictably increase as public awareness of the 4 C's and the 4 C's Initiative grows. All public land stakeholders – from individual citizens to community and other interest groups, to local and state governmental agencies, to federal land management bureaus – are the appropriate sources for 4 C's innovation.

A tabular summarization of the 23 projects is displayed below; it is keyed to the individual project discussions that follow. The summary table, as well as the individual project discussions upon which it is based, divides the 23 projects into 4 groupings. They are:

- *Community-Based Landscape Restoration Projects* – 4 C’s projects whose primary purpose is to directly engage citizens, community and interest groups, and other conservation organizations in the restoration of broad expanses of BLM lands and associated natural resources
- *Community-Based Planning and Plan Implementation Projects* – 4 C’s projects whose primary purpose is to directly engage citizens, communities, interest groups and local governments in the development of community- or consensus-based plans and subsequent place-based implementation of those plans
- *Community-Based 4 C’s Partnerships and Agreements* – 4 C’s projects whose primary purpose is to engage citizen- and community-based groups, conservation organizations and local governments in various partnerships and agreements for the purpose of implementing management activities identified in current BLM land use plans or facilitating management through the sharing of information and resources
- *Community-Based Programmatic/Institutional Initiatives* – 4 C’s projects whose primary purpose is to (1) build understanding and support within the BLM and its partners for the 4 C’s and the 4 C’s Projects Program, (2) prepare BLM staff and communities to design and participate in 4 C’s initiatives, (3) advance institutionalization of the 4 C’s within the BLM and (4) provide the needed skills and capacity for BLM staff and citizen partners that is requisite to on-the-ground success of the 4 C’s Projects Program

In addition to the division of projects into 4 groupings, the summary table displays identifying characteristics of the 23 initiatives: (1) Project name keyed by number to the project discussions in the main text; (2) Project location by state (abbreviated); (3) Project 4 C’s tools and innovations – *what are the tools and innovations that qualify each project for inclusion as a notable 4 C’s effort [see Appendix A: 4 C’s Tools: Overview and Summary]*; (4) Project population focus – *what general demographic group does the project target and involve in its implementation [e.g., is it primarily urban or rural]?*; (5) Project description – *what is the project about and what is its 4 C’s focus?*; and (6) Project contact – *what is the name of the Working Group member most knowledgeable of the selected 4 C’s initiative.*

The six identifying characteristics also structure the project narratives that follow the summary table. Those narratives, in turn, include additional elements, such as: (1) Project status – *is the project now underway, is it being planned, is it under consideration, or is it simply a conceptual proposal?*; (2) Barriers and other considerations – *what special factors come into play when assessing the project’s suitability for implementation?*; and (3) Expected 4 C’s contribution – *what is the major contribution of the project to meeting the 4 C’s Initiative mission, goal and objectives?*

<b>Project Grouping</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>State (abbr.)</b>	<b>4 C's Tools &amp; Innovations</b>	<b>Pop. Focus</b>	<b>4 C's Project Description</b>	<b>Project Contact</b>
<b>Community-Based Landscape Restoration</b>	(1) Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration	NV	Community-based planning; coalition advisory group and oversight trust; plan implementation via contracting	Rural	Landscape restoration through community-based planning and citizen participation in plan implementation	Bob Abbey, NV State Director
""	(2) NW CO Working Landscape	CO	Community-based planning; adaptive mgmt; contracts & agreements for plan implementation	Rural	Landscape restoration through community-based planning, plan implementation, and partnerships with BLM	Bob Ratcliffe, Deputy Group Mgr of Rec and Visitor Services
""	(3) Lemhi Co Planning & Restoration	ID	Land/easement transfers; partnering for restoration; plan coordination; coop and assistance agreements	Rural	Landscape restoration through land transfers, partnering agreements and coordinated plans with communities and other agencies	Dave Krosting, Field Manager, Salmon Field Office/Kit Kimball, Dir. External Affairs
""	(4) Steens Mountain Cooperative Management & Protection Project	OR	Wide-ranging citizen participation; citizen adv council, MOU's w/non-fed partners; use of volunteers	Rural-urban mix	Legislated landscape restoration guided by Advisory Council, and cooperative mgmt w/ BLM & Stakeholders	Dana Schufford, District Mgr, Burns, OR
<b>Community-Based Plans &amp; Plan Implementat'n</b>	(5) Bradshaw Foothills	AZ	Community-based planning	Urban	Develop effective community-based planning model applicable West-wide	Mike Taylor, Deputy State Director, AZ
""	(6) Galisteo Basin	NM	Community-based planning; designation of community proposal as NEPA preferred alternative	Urban	Community-based plan to protect open space, traditional culture and area's archaeological values	Jesse Juen, Associate State Director, New Mexico
""	(7) Community Viz Las Cruces	NM	Community-based planning; plan coordination with county; all enhanced by Community Viz	Mixed urban and rural	Use of Community Viz model for community-based planning and coordination of BLM and county plans	Cynthia Moses-Nedd, NACo Liaison
""	(8) Catron Co Management Initiative	NM	Community-based planning; BLM-County partnership for implementation of the shared plan	Rural	Joint BLM and County management of public lands formalized by and incorporated into the Socorro Plan Rev	Jesse Juen, Associate State Director, NM
""	(9) Farmington Plan Implement Amendment	NM	Community planning enhanced by scoping outreach; community participation in plan implementation	Mixed urban and rural	Develop foundation through community-based planning to engage community in plan implementation	Jesse Juen, Associate State Director, NM
""	(10) Las Cienegas NCA	NM	Community-based planning; community implementation of plan; adaptive mgmt	Urban	Citizen implementat'n of the Las Cienegas Natl Conservation Area community plan	Mike Taylor, Deputy State Director, AZ
<b>Community-Based 4C's Partnerships &amp; Agreements</b>	(11) Moab UT Community Collaboration	UT	Partnerships, inter-agency cooperative agreements and CMAs for county & citizen stewardship partnering w/BLM	Mixed urban and rural	Comprehensive integration and coord of Moab community-based projects for collaborative mgmt of all adj public lands	Bob Ratcliffe, Deputy Group Mgr of Rec and Visitor Services
""	(12) Bluff UT	UT	Federal-local plan consistency; coop agreements for comm. involvement	Rural	Sonoran Inst-Bluff- BLM partnership to protect open space & foster conservation by local communities	Luther Probst, Executive Dir, Sonoran Inst

<b>Project Grouping</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>State (abbr.)</b>	<b>4 C's Tools &amp; Innovations</b>	<b>Pop. Focus</b>	<b>4 C's Project Description</b>	<b>Project Contact</b>
<b>Community-Based 4C's Partnerships &amp; Agreements</b>	(13) Sandy River Basin Initiative	OR	Landscape-level partnership between BLM and multiple stakeholders	Urban	Assessment and evaluation of partnerships & related 4 C's tools in Sandy Basin	Bob Ratcliffe, Deputy Group Mgr of Rec and Visitor Services
""	(14) Western CO Counties Data Share	CO	Collaborative data-sharing partnerships	Urban and Rural	Collaborative effort by BLM and local gov't & groups to integrate and standardize data	Cynthia Moses-Nedd, NACo Liaison
""	(15) NM Native Plants	NM	BLM-Adelante RC&D cooperative agreement for seed production and rural development	Rural	Community-based native seed production to meet mandate of National Fire Plan	Jesse Juen, Associate State Director, NM
""	(16) Outside Las Vegas (OLV)	NV	OLV partnership and related 4 C's tools, including SNPLA funding mechanism	Urban	Assess/evaluate the applicability of OLV's 4 C's model and tools to west communities beyond Las Vegas, Nevada	Bob Abbey, Nevada State Director
""	(17) Taos Grass Bank	NM	BLM-community partnership for collaborative management of grass bank	Rural	Create community grass bank for range improvement; bank managed in collaboration with grazers & community	Jesse Juen, Associate State Director, NM
""	(18) Rio Arriba Co	NM	BLM-County land-use planning for consistency; exchange of BLM lands for easements	Rural	Partnership w/local gov't & community to coordinate land plan and protect ag lands from development	Jesse Juen, Associate State Director, NM
""	(19) Henry Mountains Bison Herd	UT	Flexible exercise of BLM grazing permits to facilitate non-livestock uses on allotments to meet bison forage needs	Rural and Urban	BLM, permittees and sportsmen partnership for livestock-bison multiple use mgmt in the Henry Mountains of southern Utah	Don Peay, 801-635-5576 and Ron Hodson, Utah Div of Wildlife, 435-650-1040
<b>Community-Based Programmatic Institutional Initiatives</b>	(20) Foster Community Relations & Expertise	N/A	Community liaison/coordinator for community relations; other community assistance/outreach	Urban and rural	Evaluate community liaison staff and other options to build BLM community relations capacity	Bob Ratcliffe, Deputy Group Mgr of Rec and Visitor Services
""	(21) Collaborative Planning/Adaptive Management Workshop	N/A	Capacity building for collaborative plan and adaptive mgmt among managers	Urban and rural	Develop collaborative planning and adaptive mgmt workshop for BLM managers	Elena Daly, Dir Ntl Landscape Conservation System
""	(22) National Recreation & Visitor Workshop	N/A	Collaborative development of strategic plan; stakeholder partnering to implement plan	Urban and rural	Convene BLM Natl Recreation and Visitor Summit for a dialogue on partnered BLM recreation and visitor services strategy	Bob Ratcliffe, Deputy Group Mgr of Rec and Visitor Services
""	(23) Taos Centralized Emergency Dispatch	NM	Coordination of communication services	Town and County of Taos	Establish centralized community dispatch center for enhanced local communication services	Jesse Juen, Associate State Director, NM

## *Community-Based Landscape Restoration Projects*

### **(1) Great Basin Restoration Initiative: Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project**

**Project Highlight** – Landscape restoration through community-based planning and citizen participation in plan implementation

Project Location – Eastern Nevada

Project Status – Early implementation stage (project on-hold pending completion of Ely RMP/EIS)

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Consensus- and community-based planning, planning and implementation advisory group (the Coalition), citizen oversight entity (the Trust), and contracting for project implementation

Project's Population Focus – Primarily rural: affected communities, counties, local government and communities of interest statewide and regionally

Project Background – The nation is today threatened with the loss of one of its most valued treasures, the Great Basin, which encompasses most of Nevada, the western half of Utah, the lower third of Idaho, the southeast corner of Oregon and a narrow strip of eastern California. This unique and varied landscape is made up of a delicate complex of ecosystems which support a multitude of diverse plant and animal species.

The Great Basin's productivity is being destroyed, in part by devastating wildfires that scorched more than 1.7 million acres across Nevada in 1999, and in part by noxious weeds and non-native annual grasses (i.e., cheatgrass). Gaining a foothold where fire has weakened or removed native shrubs, cheatgrass and other noxious weeds, including various non-native annual grasses, have established a grass/fire/grass cycle of expansion, which is spreading rapidly across the western states. Consequently, entire watersheds are being threatened and water quality degraded. Native wildlife habitat is rapidly disappearing, as is forage for wild horses and livestock. Recreational opportunities are also being diminished and local economies threatened.

Project Description – A 72-million-acre Bureau of Land Management (BLM) program called the Great Basin Restoration Initiative (GBRI) is an umbrella for a variety of projects to restore and maintain the Great Basin's diverse and resilient native plant species. The Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project (ENLRP) is a key component of GBRI. The ENLRP project area encompasses approximately 10 million acres of public land in eastern Nevada administered by the BLM Ely Field Office. ENLRP's goal is to restore the ecological health of the eastern Nevada sagebrush ecosystem by improving or maintaining (1) habitat condition and productivity [weed management, forest thinning, etc.], (2) watershed function and stability, (3) riparian area function and condition and (4) species diversity and composition. ENLRP seeks also to protect Native American cultural values and foster sustainable rural communities and economies. ENLRP's success rests on developing a broad-based consensus among stakeholders on what constitutes the Great Basin's future desired health in eastern Nevada and what actions to implement to reach that land-health outcome.

The Eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition (ENLC) is the institutional vehicle that drives the ENLRP. It is a community-based partnership of more than 60 entities that represent agricultural, conservation, cultural, environmental, private enterprise, and local, state and federal government interests. ENLC's mission is to restore through collaborative efforts the Great Basin's dynamic and diverse landscapes in eastern Nevada for present and future generations. Its purpose is to assist in project planning and implementation by establishing broad-based goals and objectives, determining processes, advising on project implementation, and providing the best available science. ENLC encourages and facilitates cooperation and communication among the many interested parties.

Barriers and Other Considerations – Recent litigation revealed that the BLM Ely Field Office's Resource Management Plans and Management Framework Plan (RMP/MFP) were inadequate, thus providing a significant roadblock to ENLRP implementation. The BLM Ely Field Office is today preparing the Ely Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) that will provide management direction for all BLM programs in the planning area for future years. It will also address through NEPA process and documentation the planning deficiencies that have, to date, blocked implementation of the ENLRP but which, upon revision and completion, should allow full implementation of the project, consistent with existing law, rules and policy.

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Establishment of new institutional arrangements for direct citizen involvement in the restoration, management and long-term stewardship of BLM lands at the landscape level.

## **(2) Moffat County Northwest Colorado Working Landscape Project**

**Project Highlight** – Landscape restoration through community-based planning, plan implementation, and partnerships with BLM

Project Location – Northwest Colorado

Project Status – Now in proposal stage

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Consensus- and community-based planning, outcome-based adaptive management, cooperative agreements and contracts for project implementation

Project's Population Focus – Primarily rural: local communities, county government, affected land users and communities of interest statewide

Project Background – The Moffat County Commission released on December 2001 a report entitled *Northwest Colorado Working Landscape Trust*. The report presented a proposal for establishment of a Public Trust made up of local, county, state and other designated representatives who would assume management responsibility over all Bureau of Land Management (BLM), National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands contained within Moffat County. Public release of the proposal generated broad press coverage in the West. Because the Trust could not be implemented within the existing authority of the Department, the Moffat County Commissioners

re-issued a proposal B *Northwest Colorado Working Landscape Pilot Project Proposal* B intended to be consistent with the existing administrative authority of the Department.

Project Description – The *Northwest Colorado Working Landscape Pilot Project Proposal* calls for the BLM to work with Moffat County “to find ways consistent with the Secretary’s 4 C’s agenda to implement elements of the proposed pilot project.” Specifically, the project proposal requests that consideration be given to development and adoption of a pilot citizen-based conservation initiative on federal lands (initially BLM only; NPS and USFWS lands to follow in subsequent phases) that would be:

- \$ consistent with the social and ecological parameters of a *working landscape* framework;
- \$ firmly anchored in consensus-based community planning;
- \$ committed to a policy of *net conservation gains* landscape-wide;
- \$ committed to a policy of *multiple use* linked to *multiple responsibilities*; and
- \$ implemented by a *science-based* policy of *outcome-based performance management*

The Moffat County Commission has advanced the proposal in the belief it offers an opportunity “to integrate human activity with conservation activities” in a manner most consistent with (a) sustaining human communities, (b) fostering viable local economies, and (c) ensuring ecosystem landscape health *through restoration and subsequent conservation and sustainable use*.

The *Northwest Colorado Working Landscape Pilot Project Proposal* is a landscape restoration initiative offered in partnership between the BLM and Moffat County, with local government, individuals and organizations playing a critical and participatory role in both restoration project planning and plan implementation. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and National Park Service lands and administration (Brown’s Park National Wildlife Refuge and Dinosaur National Monument) are proposed to be included in the project at some point in time. Restoration and conservation-support activities identified by the County and the BLM include:

- Fire and Fuels Management
- Management for desired plant communities
- Management of air quality and water quantity and quality
- Improvement of wildlife habitat (e.g., sage grouse)
- Listed species recovery (e.g., black-footed ferret)
- Noxious weed control
- Appropriate mixing of energy development and conservation
- Net conservation gain in all land use activities
- Development of long-term funding for conservation

Three administrative steps are proposed for implementation of the proposal. One, the planning process for the project (revising the Little Snake RMP) will be community-driven and consensus-based; the community alternative is proposed to be adopted as the BLM preferred alternative. Two, the new RMP will provide the procedural (NEPA and administrative) foundation for adaptive, outcome-based management. Three, implementation of restoration and management activities within the outcome-based performance framework of the plan will be conducted to the extent possible in partnership with individuals, citizen groups and local government using an array of cooperative agreements, contracts and other partnering devices. The state’s regional RAC will participate in project planning and implementation, and provide oversight, advice on

monitoring, and support (including, if feasible, fund-raising) through sub-groups and/or technical range teams.

Barriers and Other Considerations – The original Moffat County proposal -- *Northwest Colorado Working Landscape Trust* – may be confused in the minds of some agency and public parties with the current working landscape proposal, which does not entail transfer of management authority to a Trust entity. This could lead to misunderstanding and conflict on the goals and objectives of the proposed initiative. Wilderness is also a contested issue in Moffat County and may be a source of contention in project implementation. Similarly, proposed energy development in the Vermillion Basin could also give rise to conflict within the project area. Most significantly, the Moffat County proposal would involve Interior agencies and lands other than BLM. This represents a major challenge as well as opportunity for the Department to engage in landscape-level management that is inclusive of all land authorities and ownerships.

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Establishment of new institutional arrangements for direct citizen involvement in the restoration, management and long-term stewardship of BLM lands *and other Interior-managed lands* at the landscape level.

### **(3) Lemhi County Planning and Restoration Project**

**Project Highlight** – Landscape restoration through land transfers, partnering agreements and coordinated plans with communities and other agencies

Project Location – East-Central Idaho

Project Status – In various stages of proposal, planning and implementation

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – BLM land transfers for conservation easements on private lands, BLM-landowner restoration partnerships, coordinated planning and management between federal, state and local governments, cooperative and assistance agreements, and cooperative land use planning

Project's Population Focus – Primarily rural; local communities, land users and participating state, county and city governments

Project Background – The Salmon Field Office is located in Lemhi County, Idaho. Lemhi County comprises about 2.9 million acres, of which 92% is public owned (federal and state). The economy of the area is heavily dependent upon these public lands, as there is little private land base. The social and cultural customs of the area have always been tied to the traditional extractive industries of mining, logging, and ranching. As these traditional industries have declined in recent years, forward-thinking individuals in Lemhi County have looked for new ways to protect the values of the community and ensure continued economic prosperity. These individuals have come together to form partnerships with a common goal of protection of the environment while allowing for development to serve the social and cultural needs of the community and nation.

Project Description – The Lemhi County Planning and Restoration Project is comprised of an array of activities in various stages of proposal, planning or implementation. The partnerships that underlay these efforts are coordinated by the BLM's Salmon Field Office and include:

- **Upper Salmon Basin Watershed Project-** This project involves a number of federal and state partners along with private landowners in restoration of fish habitat for anadromous and resident fish on a holistic watershed basis.
- **Coordinated Weed Management-** The Salmon Field Office is partnering with city, county, state and other federal agencies for the control and eradication of noxious weeds within the county.
- **Cooperative Riparian Management Agreement-** This agreement was established after the ESA listing of chinook salmon in an effort to improve riparian conditions throughout Lemhi County to preclude further ESA listings.
- **Coordinated Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Planning-** The Salmon Field Office has entered into assistance agreements with Lemhi County and the City of Salmon for planning for the upcoming Lewis & Clark bicentennial, including funding for the Sacajawea Center, a city-owned interpretive and educational center.
- **Coordinated Sub-Basin Planning-** The field office has led efforts culminating in a Lemhi sub-basin assessment, and involving numerous federal, state, and local partners. This was done under the umbrella of the Department of the Interior's Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project.
- **Coordinated Watershed Planning-** The field office has been involved with three cooperative watershed level planning efforts done within the framework of ecosystem analysis at the watershed scale.
- **Cooperative Fire Management Planning and Implementation-** The BLM recently completed an Interdisciplinary Activity Plan for Fire Management that involved state and federal agencies, tribes, and the interested public in fire planning.
- **Cooperative Land-Use Planning-** The Salmon Field Office has begun an effort, along with City of Salmon and Lemhi County partners, in comprehensive land-use planning. This partnership is designed to determine the best areas for growth, in order to protect the character, customs, and social values of the local community. Partners include the City of Salmon and Lemhi County.

The Sonoran Institute is also participating as a partner in the Cooperative Land-Use Planning initiative. The Institute's involvement is summarized below:

#### Sonoran Institute Project Addendum

In 2000, a group of ranchers and public land managers in Salmon, Idaho, invited the Sonoran Institute to help them improve the viability of the 70,000-acre Diamond Moose Grazing Association's grazing permit on national forest land west of the Salmon River. The permittees have sustained significant losses to wolf predation. Subsequent mitigation efforts have not been successful, and permittees are now interested in finding alternative forage for their cattle and exploring stewardship contracting with BLM. The Sonoran Institute is currently working with ranchers on ways to secure alternative private forage. A local steering committee of landowners, county commissioners, economic development specialists, and federal land managers is exploring various options to purchase easements on deeded land to further prevent the fragmentation of agricultural lands and wildlife habitat along the Salmon River. The steering committee has embarked on a critical mapping exercise to identify lands

### Sonoran Institute Project Addendum Con't

within the county of high ecological and agricultural value for conservation and protection purposes.

In Spring 2002, a team of officials from Lemhi County attended a training workshop, sponsored jointly by the Sonoran Institute and the National Association of Counties. The workshop exposed county officials to state-of-the-art thinking about how to manage burgeoning growth while protecting significant local assets. Of particular concern to county officials was the decline in local agriculture, as ranch and farmlands are being converted into subdivisions primarily for retirees moving to Lemhi County.

The Sonoran Institute is now assisting Lemhi County in developing a new comprehensive plan, including zoning and subdivision regulations. County officials already have provided political and financial support for the mapping study, which will generate important information for their planning efforts. They also are exploring with the BLM the possibility of a land exchange, whereby farmers and ranchers would receive ownership of BLM lands of low ecological value in exchange for permanently protecting their agricultural lands from development with conservation easements.

Lemhi County's leadership in managing growth presents a tremendous opportunity to mitigate livestock-wolf conflicts, maintain wildlife connectivity through the Salmon River drainage, and protect threatened working landscapes from fragmentation due to residential subdivisions. The timing is right to work with landowners, who are willing sellers of grazing and development interests; grazing permittees, who are interested in exploring innovations on grazing leases that are of marginal utility in traditional uses; the county, which is embarking on a new round of land-use planning; and federal agencies, which are now willing to cooperate with local stakeholders in land management prerogatives to reflect changing public values. Moreover, there is real potential to develop a high-profile success story in Idaho where there is a dire need to demonstrate the benefits of locally driven conservation.

**Barriers and Other Considerations** – The BLM's Salmon District received high levels of agency funding for initial planning and implementation of elements of the project. Funding has fallen significantly, and will likely continue to decrease in the future. Continuation of the project will depend on non-traditional funding, particularly through the BLM's partnerships with the community and with non-profit groups such as the Sonoran Institute.

**Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution** – Integration of multiple partnership projects into a coordinated and comprehensive working landscape initiative capable of incorporating citizen-based stewardship in essential planning and management functions.

#### **(4) Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Area Project**

**Project Highlight** – Congressionally-legislated landscape management project to conserve, protect and manage the long-term ecological integrity of Steens Mountain and to maintain the cultural, economic, environmental and social health of the surrounding area. The project is guided by a citizen Advisory Council and implemented through volunteerism, broad collaboration between BLM and stakeholders, and cooperative management.

**Project Location** – Southeastern Oregon

**Project Status** – Underway; first phase implemented

**Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations** – The Steens Mountain project was enabled through special legislation: the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Act of 2000 (Act). The Act provided for five land exchanges totaling 120,000 acres. The project's 4 C's significance is twofold. First, it has been largely successful in establishing a viable landscape-level solution to conflicting rural and urban and user-group interests in a way that integrates a

sustainable, working landscape with special conservation designations. Second, it has consistently and thoroughly involved citizen groups, landowners, land-users, local and state governments and cooperating federal agencies in the planning and implementation of the Act's mandate. The 4 C's tools used in implementation include a citizen's advisory council, memorandums of understanding with federal and non-federal partners and reliance on volunteer assistance for project activities.

Project's Population Focus – Rural-urban mix; includes affected land users, adjacent rural communities, local governments, urban conservation groups and other urban stakeholders with interest in wilderness and outdoor recreation

Project Background – During the last administration, a number of public lands across the West and Alaska were newly designated as National Conservation Areas, National Monuments, Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and National Scenic and Historic Trails to help protect some of the nation's most remarkable and rugged landscapes. Steens Mountain with its extraordinary landscape (volcanic uplifts, deep glacial carved gorges, stunning scenery, wilderness, wild rivers, and a rich diversity of plant and animal species) was one of the areas the past administration considered deserving of special designation. However, many residents within the area of Steens Mountain were opposed to a National Monument designation. When faced with the challenge of what designation would be appropriate, local citizens strongly supported an Oregon-initiated solution.

Project Description – Through a bipartisan Congressional effort and extensive collaboration among a wide array of local, regional, and national interests, the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Act of 2000 (Act) was passed. The Act addressed to the extent possible the interests of both local residents and urban conservation advocates. Some of the special features of the Act include:

- Creation of the Steens Mountain Advisory Council (SMAC)
- Creation of a 900,000-acre mineral withdrawal area; a 425,550-acre Cooperative Management and Protection Area (CMPA); 169,465 acres of public land to create the Steens Mountain Wilderness Area of which 97,071 acres are a No Livestock Grazing Area (the first of its kind); two new Wild and Scenic Rivers and two new segments to the existing Donner und Blitzen River; a Wildland Juniper Management (Demonstration) Area; and a Redband Trout Reserve
- Provision for five land exchanges totaling 120,000 acres to acquire inholdings in the Wilderness and No Livestock Grazing Area
- Mandate to maintain the cultural, economic, ecological, and social health of the Steens Mountain area
- Provisions to provide for, expand, maintain and/or enhance cooperative and innovative management activities/practices between public and private landowners
- Assurances for traditional access to cultural, gathering, religious and archaeological sites by the Burns Paiute Tribe
- Mechanisms to promote and foster cooperation, communication, and understanding and to reduce conflict between Steens Mountain users and interests
- Commitment to promote viable and sustainable grazing, recreation operations and historic uses on private and public lands in the project area
- Commitment to conserve, protect, and manage Steens Mountain for healthy watersheds and long-term ecological integrity

At the heart of the Act is the purpose and process by which to conserve, protect, and manage the long-term ecological integrity of the Steens Mountain Area – a citizen-based initiative using a collaborative process that fosters cooperative management between private landowners, local and regional interests, and BLM. The Act is unique in its depth of special designations and prescriptions for management direction. Although complex, the Act presents a prime opportunity for the BLM to showcase not just a landscape rich in natural resource diversity, but also its ability to effectively work with the local community, governments, tribal and special interests, and landowners to manage for ecological integrity while providing for traditional uses which include continuance of a working landscape throughout many areas of the project.

The Steens Mountain Advisory Council is one of the major 4 C's outcomes of the project. Created by the 2000 enabling Act, the council's membership was appointed by the Secretary of the Interior on August 14, 2001. The SMAC's purpose is to provide representative counsel and advice to the BLM regarding (1) new and unique approaches to management of the land within the bounds of the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Area (CMPA), (2) cooperative programs and incentives for landscape management that meet human needs, maintain and improve the ecological and economic integrity of the area and (3) preparation and implementation of a management plan for the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Area (CMPA).

The SMAC represents a broad array of interests such as dispersed recreation, mechanized or consumptive recreation, wild horse management, recreational permit holder, private landowner, grazing permittees, fish and recreational fishing, environmental representation from the state and local level, the Burns Paiute Tribe and a state government liaison (nonvoting member) as specified in the legislation.

Project outcomes to date include:

- The SMAC has already held ten meetings since its inception and has made recommendations to the BLM regarding environmental assessments, recreation, interpretation, Land and Water Conservation Funding, the Interim Management Policy, project implementation, wilderness zoning, wild horse and burro gathers, Wildland Juniper Area appropriations, and the Roaring Springs land exchange which was an integral part of the Act. They are currently tackling the difficult issue of transportation and recreation within the CMPA. The transportation plan will be an essential part of the Resource Management Plan required by the Act. The group's top three priorities are transportation, recreation and wildlife.
- The five legislated land exchanges were completed in April 2002. A NEPA issue was raised early on by a conservation organization, and the Western Lands Project. However, landowners, other environmental groups and Congressional staffs worked collaboratively to expedite the exchanges, pursuant to the Act. There has been no negative reaction to these exchanges.
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Malheur National Wildlife Refuge), Harney County Court, City of Hines, City of Burns, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality have all signed Memorandums of Understanding to be cooperating agencies in the BLM planning effort. The Burns Paiute Tribe, the City of Burns, and Oregon Department of Fish and Game have all shown in interest in becoming a cooperating agency as well. The RMP continues to be on schedule for

completion in October 2004.

- NEPA has been conducted, along with extensive outreach to landowners and environmental groups, for the implementation of projects proposed to achieve the legislated “no livestock grazing area.” The first phase of this implementation has been initiated, and there is interest from landowners and environmental groups to expedite project construction.
- The Steens Mountain Wilderness was created to provide for the ecology integrity of the mountain. Major routes (Loop Road) adjacent to the Steens Mountain Wilderness were left out of wilderness to continue to provide access to the Mountain. Boundary signing has been completed.
- The Harney County Chamber of Commerce, a subcommittee of the SMAC, landowners, and BLM through a Memorandum of Understanding have worked collaboratively and designed a unique portal sign (within BLM guidelines) into the CMPA. Their efforts are now focused on a road advisory sign, an information kiosk, and possible development of a public wayside/rest area.
- Volunteers have been instrumental in the removal of unwanted fence within the no livestock grazing area.

Barriers and Other Considerations – The legislation authorizing the Steens Mountain project is vague and/or sometimes contradictory in several of its provisions, creating some disharmony among local residents, special recreation permit holders, grazing permittees, and BLM.

Expected Principal 4 C’s Contribution – A citizen-based landscape management solution to conflicting land goals and land uses relying on cooperation and collaboration among multiple partners for multiple outcomes spanning the spectrum of working landscapes to special protected areas.

[Note: The Working Group discussed at length support for or development of 4 C’s projects that encourage and allow communities to establish their own versions of special landscape designations that may or may not entail formalization as National Monuments, National Recreation Areas (NRA), etc. The Working Group was particularly concerned that local fears of “land lockups” and fears by various interest-based communities of “exclusion” of their activities under certain designations was pre-empting needed conservation action and precluding otherwise beneficial designations. The Steens Mountain project is an example. It is an Oregon-based alternative to a locally-unpopular National Monument designation. Not all alternatives to formal Monument designation require legislation, however. The Working Group strongly recommends that one or more 4 C’s projects be considered for landscapes recognized as areas of special use but without formal Monument or NRA designation. These projects would entail partnerships between BLM and local communities and citizen groups to explore place-based alternatives to formal designations – or modifications to pre-existing formal designations – that address local concerns. In all instances, BLM should constrain its role to working with the community to arrive at acceptable alternative designations. Such designations should evolve from a bottom-up process of community deliberation, assisted by BLM but without any imposition by BLM of a preferred solution.]

### *Community-Based Planning and Plan Implementation Projects*

#### **(5) Bradshaw Foothills Resource Management Plan Project**

**Project Highlight – Development of an effective community-based planning model applicable westwide.**

Project Location – South-central Arizona

Project Status – RMP in mid-development stage; scoping process completed and now entering alternative formulation stage

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Community-based planning

Project's Population Focus – Primarily urban; Phoenix greater metropolitan area and surrounding communities

Project Background – Phoenix has experienced extreme growth levels over the last decade. Much of this growth has been in the north valley, towards the Bradshaw Mountains. The Bureau of Land management manages over 60 percent of the land in the lower elevations. Urban interface conflicts are increasing as growing numbers of the public utilize the area for recreation. OHV use has shown a marked increase as well as equestrian sports and hiking. Recreational shooting is increasing conflict with other forms of recreation, creating unsafe conditions when non-shooting recreationists frequent what are now open shooting areas. There is also a growing demand by developers for more land, bringing pressure for land exchanges or other land tenure adjustments.

Project Description – The rapid growth of Phoenix and the attendant urban interface conflicts have made the existing Bradshaw Foothills Resource Management Plan obsolete. In 1998, to set the stage for a plan amendment, the Phoenix Field Office (PFO) instituted an effort to better identify the land users and to engage them in a collaborative dialog. The Field Office hosted a “Learning Communities” workshop sponsored by the National Training Center in conjunction with James Kent and Associates, drawing in members of user groups, local elected officials, community leaders and the interested public. As a result of that gathering, PFO continued to engage communities, establishing working relationships with a number of communities including Castle Hot Springs, Black Canyon City, Cordes Junction, Wickenburg and Phoenix.

The Phoenix Field Office is now taking the community-based philosophy forward into the Bradshaw Foothills Planning effort. Community outreach efforts in the form of numerous public meetings and workshops have been conducted over the last year and a half, enhancing the previously established community relationships with PFO. The public has enthusiastically supported this approach and to date there has been great success in bringing diverse and often-conflicting user groups together. The planning effort is currently at the end of the scoping stage and moving into alternative formulation.

This community-based planning initiative is a major step in developing effective community-based planning models that are applicable to other urban interface areas in the West. The effort exemplifies and develops to new levels of innovation and implementation a non-traditional collaborative planning process for BLM that makes citizen stewardship the guiding principle in plan formulation and implementation. Because the project is now in the beginning stages of the formal NEPA/planning process, it presents a unique opportunity to develop and hone a 4 C's approach to community-based planning that exemplifies urban interface issues and that enjoys wide support in the public sector.

Barriers and Other Considerations – The Bradshaw Foothills project exemplifies one of the dilemmas of community-based planning that has hindered adoption of this promising 4 C’s tool. Community-based planning requires “up-front” preparation and costs that are not required of traditional, top-down planning. Citizen training and preparation for community-based planning, not to mention BLM staff capacity building, is time consuming. Moreover, the process of citizen participation – of citizens driving the planning process – is more complex, more time-demanding and more costly than unilateral plan preparation by the agency. As a result, plans formulated with and by community participation can take months longer to complete than traditional planning documents, and at a far greater initial cost. This has discouraged many BLM offices from engaging communities fully in the planning process.

BLM managers, for example, are subject to performance evaluations based on criteria such as number of plans completed within a specific time period. This discourages local agency support for more time-consuming and costly 4 C’s approaches to planning that are innovative and incorporate, as well as rely upon, citizen direction and stewardship. Not considered in agency performance evaluations are the long-term advantages of community-based planning. Offsetting their upfront time demands and costs are their long-term avoidance of appeals and litigation. Unlike conventional agency-driven plans, community-based plans are subject to far less administrative and judicial challenge. This in itself advances the 4 C’s. More to the point, the total commitment of agency time and resources to community-based plans is less than that allocated to conventional plans when both plan preparation and post-plan appeals and litigation are factored into the overall assessment. The Working Group strongly advises that the assessment of community-based planning be based on all relevant factors, and not just time and costs required for completion of the initial planning document.

[Note: The Working Group has identified two additional variables that are pertinent to community-based planning.

- One, it is important to involve staff in all aspects of community outreach. This increases upfront planning costs but, in the long-run, reduces conflict that might otherwise be associated with planning products and their implementation.
- Two, the costs of community-based planning can be significantly reduced if developed within a framework of adaptive management. BLM plans last for up to 20 years, and, for the most part, field offices treat those plans as relatively unchanging. To produce a plan that is sufficiently durable to withstand twenty years without substance amendment, the planning process must incorporate copious – and expensive – amounts of data. In contrast, adaptive management plans require a less robust and, therefore, less expensive and time-consuming data base by virtue of their reliance on monitoring to update and revise plan activities on a continuous basis. Not only does adaptive management translate into reduced planning costs, but it equates to plans that are more dynamic, flexible and suitable to a changing natural and socio-economic environment.]

Expected Principal 4 C’s Contribution – The Bradshaw Foothills Project will provide an important model for development and application of community-based planning tools applicable to highly urbanized areas that are characterized by multiple resource use conflicts.

## **(6) Galisteo Basin Project**

**Project Highlight** – A BLM/citizen-county partnered community-based plan to protect open space, traditional culture and archaeological values in the Galisteo-Santa Fe area.

Project Location – Northern New Mexico

Project Status – Proposal stage; discussions now underway with affected communities; planning effort has begun for the Cerrillos Hills with a decision due this spring.

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Community-based planning where the community's proposal for the Galisteo Basin would be adopted by BLM as the preferred alternative in the NEPA process. Plans for individual communities would be incorporated into a general basin plan.

Project's Population Focus – Primarily urban; the city of Santa Fe and communities in Santa Fe County, including the Cerrillos area to the southwest of Santa Fe

Project Background – Santa Fe, New Mexico, is experiencing accelerated growth at the urban interface. Similarly, Santa Fe County is one of the most rapidly growing areas of the state. Major issues that need to be addressed through comprehensive planning include: protection of natural and cultural resources; assurance of a reliable water supply; illegal dumping; management of OHV use; protection of local culture; and community participation in land and resource management activities.

Project Description – Local communities want to balance conservation and open space protection with the demands for growth and land development in the greater Santa Fe area. Local communities have been very supportive of recent acquisitions of undeveloped land by BLM and local government for the purpose of protecting open space in a fashion consistent with the ongoing need to accommodate population growth. The communities are particularly concerned about balancing future changes brought by urbanization with the protection of their existing traditional and largely non-urban life styles.

The BLM has been working with local governments, communities and interest groups such as the Trust for Public Lands to acquire properties critical for the protection of open space in the rapidly expanding greater Santa Fe area. Preliminary discussions are now taking place on a community-based effort that would achieve this goal, while at the same time allowing for managed growth consistent with the traditional, small-clustered-community character of the area. A key part of the community planning initiative and an essential part of determining pattern and extent of growth in Santa Fe County, will be the manner in which the area's restricted water supply – much of which is accessible only on or across BLM lands -- is addressed.

The project is envisioned as a partnership between BLM, local government and affected communities. It will utilize consensus-based planning on BLM lands and will designate the community's action proposal as the preferred alternative in the NEPA documentation process. Preparation is now underway to develop such a community-based plan in the Cerrillos area to the southwest of Santa Fe. Known as the Galisteo Basin, the project will help local citizens and local government better protect open space and the integrity of surrounding communities while simultaneously providing protection for the area's rich archaeological heritage and conservation stewardship to the area's native range and wildlife.

Barriers and Other Considerations – The institutional barriers discussed under the Bradshaw Foothills project apply here as well: extended time frames for community participation, agency focus on plan completion rather than the success of the project as a whole. Procedures for aggregation of community plans into a general plan (the process currently flows the other way: general plans to specific plans) are not in place. Implications for NEPA compliance, such as cumulative impact analysis, will have to be accommodated. In addition, there is a general distrust and reluctance to work with governmental agencies within some of the communities who will need to be involved in the project. Pending legislation specific to the protection of cultural resources, and associated commitments and timeframes, if passed, will have to be worked into the process.

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Community-based plan that will serve as the BLM's preferred alternative in the NEPA documentation process, as well as a final plan that governs activities within the area and is a product of, and necessitates, community participation.

## **(7) Las Cruces Community Viz Project**

**Project Highlight** – Use of Community Viz computer simulation model to facilitate community-based planning and coordination of BLM and Dona Ana County land-use plans.

Project Location – Southwest New Mexico, Las Cruces and Dona Ana County, NM

Project Status – Proposal stage

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Coordination of BLM and Dona Ana land plans through community-based planning enhanced by the Community Viz computer model

Project's Population Focus – Mixed urban and rural; Las Cruces metropolitan area and surrounding rural communities and settlements in Dona Ana County

Project Background – The Orton Family Foundation is a nonprofit, private operating foundation working with small cities and rural communities as they cope with rapid economic, social and environmental change. The foundation has developed Community Viz, a computer simulation model for city and community growth that has broad applications in land-use planning, natural resource management, urban planning, community planning, and landscape architecture. Community Viz allows users to depict their current community structure and growth pattern visually on computer screens and then to project that structure and growth pattern into the future based on a number of different development scenarios. These scenarios – all visually depicted – provide local governments and residents with an effective tool to undertake responsible land use planning consistent with the values of those cities and rural communities.

Project Description – The BLM proposes using Community Viz in the planning efforts of the Las Cruces Field Office in coordination with Dona Ana County for joint planning exercises to update the land management plans for that area. The BLM is in the midst of updating and revising many of its land use plans. In order to implement plans which reflect the full scope of public land use as well as the needs and concerns of the surrounding community, the BLM is working closely with local governments to coordinate land use planning efforts and to factor into such plans those activities which occur at the critical wildland-urban interface. Community Viz will be a critical part of these efforts.

Community Viz is a GIS-based software program that will allow the Las Cruces BLM Field office, local governments and the Las Cruces-Dona Ana County community to visualize hypothetical growth scenarios through aerial views of development patterns. Most critically, Community Viz will facilitate and foster community involvement and participation with BLM and local governments in determining the future of their city and communities. It will provide a technological foundation for community-based planning that better informs and prepares citizens to make long-term decisions about growth and open space conservation.

Barriers and Other Considerations – None

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Coordinated BLM-County land-use plans; broad community-based participation in planning development fostered by Community Viz Technology; and synchronization of federal and local land-use goals and objectives

### **(8) Catron County Management Initiative Project**

**Project Highlight** – Joint BLM and County management of public lands formalized by and incorporated into the Socorro plan revision.

Project Location – Southwest New Mexico, Socorro Field Office

Project Status – Proposal stage

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Community formulation of alternatives in land planning process and development of a joint BLM-Catron County management initiative for public lands lying within the county's political boundaries

Project's Population Focus – Primarily rural; county government, local communities and local land users; minor participation anticipated from interested public in Arizona (Tucson-Phoenix) and New Mexico (Santa Fe-Albuquerque-Las Cruces)

Project Background – Catron County has been significantly impacted by declines in timber and livestock production on both National Forest and BLM lands. Moreover, Catron County has long advocated greater county involvement in federal land-use planning and increased coordination between federal and local land-use plans. In addition, the county has sought an active role for itself and its citizens in management and stewardship of federal lands.

Project Description – The BLM is proposing to establish a joint management initiative with Catron County. Currently, the Socorro Field Office is in the early stages of a Plan revision, which will allow incorporation of the initiative into the planning effort. Community involvement will be emphasized in the development of the plan, including formulation of NEPA alternatives and the supporting analysis for those alternatives. It is anticipated that the overall planning effort will contribute significantly to new forms and processes of community participation in public land planning.

To ensure maximum community involvement in the planning process, BLM is developing problem solving workshops that will bring the communities in the planning area to the table to help address issues they raised in the scoping process. The outputs from these workshops will

help in all aspects of the proposed community-driven planning process – particularly in alternative formulation. To facilitate place-based alternative formulation, BLM will ask the counties in the planning area to bring to the process their sources of data which address the scoping issues. In addition, BLM will use in cooperation with local county governments the Sonoran Institute's Economic Profile System as a tool in this planning effort.

Catron County's active participation in the planning effort will be essential to establishing the foundation for the joint management project in the Plan revision. BLM and the county are reviewing the Moffat County proposal for elements that might be appropriate to the joint management initiative. In addition, the National Fire Plan and the President's Healthy Forests Initiative provide tools and afford opportunities to engage the county in the daily management of BLM lands lying within its political boundaries.

Barriers and Other Considerations – The Socorro Field Office has not previously engaged communities in land-use planning to the degree proposed. Neither local communities nor BLM staff has the skills and experience needed for successful community-based planning. This deficiency will have to be addressed with appropriate capacity building. In addition, a management partnership between BLM and the county may require incorporation of adaptive management in the Plan revision. Moreover, past events in Catron County's recent history could spark conflict with conservation groups in surrounding urban areas. To minimize conflict, it is essential that the community-based planning process be transparent and inclusive.

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – New model of community and county participation in the BLM land planning process and pioneer development of BLM-citizen co-management partnering agreements that will significantly expand the citizen role in long-term stewardship of public lands.

## **(9) Farmington Plan Amendment Implementation Project**

**Project Highlight** – Development of foundation through community-based planning to engage Farmington community in the implementation of the Farmington Field Office plan amendment.

Project Location – Northwest New Mexico

Project Status – Plan implementation will begin upon completion of the Farmington planning amendment in May, 2003.

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Expanded scoping for greater community input into the planning process and subsequent community participation in plan implementation for key local issues such as transportation and oil and gas site maintenance and rehabilitation.

Project's Population Focus – Rural and urban mix; local government, affected towns and broad range of public land users, mostly in NW New Mexico

Project Background – The Farmington Field Office will complete a plan amendment in May, 2003, affecting a broad range of land uses and users. In order to expand public participation in the planning process, the BLM took action prior to the initiation of the Farmington Plan amendment. The agency hired a contractor to do extensive community outreach that exceeded normal expectations for the scoping process. The contractor went to numerous gathering places

in the Farmington area to interview local people. His interviews yielded a number of findings that BLM included in the plan amendment and that have subsequently provided the basis for citizen involvement in plan implementation.

Project Description – Expanded citizen involvement in the planning process allowed BLM to identify issues and needs based on information that would not have been accessible through the normal scoping process and was not known to local government. In previous planning efforts, BLM would have missed these issues and findings and would have had to amend the plan at some later date to address them – or, in a worse case scenario, would simply have had to delay a decision until the next planning cycle.

Up-front citizen participation in the planning process is the foundation for the Farmington plan implementation project. Having identified major public issues and findings through expansive public participation, BLM is looking to citizens and local government to play in a key role in implementing plan activities.

For example, early and extensive citizen involvement in formulating the Farmington plan has already resulted in two citizen-based implementation initiatives. One initiative is led by the rancher working group. Its efforts are focused on implementing plan provisions for improving oil and gas site maintenance and rehabilitation. With BLM support, the group intends to be actively involved in all aspects of plan implementation relating to oil and gas. Another initiative is the citizen-based transportation working group. It is working on current road maintenance issues and will assist in the implementation of all transportation aspects of the plan. This latter initiative will help identify future growth concerns within the greater Farmington area and address the expansion needs of surrounding communities.

BLM, in partnership with local government and citizen groups, intends to expand citizen involvement in plan implementation into other issues and activities. The Farmington plan implementation project will help demonstrate and develop processes for community involvement in the implementation of BLM resource management plans.

Barriers and Other Considerations – None

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Increased participation in and new roles for citizen implementation of land-use plans and citizen stewardship of public resources

### **(10) Las Cienegas National Conservation Area Project**

**Project Highlight** – Citizen implementation of the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area community-based plan within an adaptive management framework.

Project Location – Las Cienegas National Conservation Area, Southern Arizona, near Tucson

Project Status – Final plan decision imminent; plan implementation set to begin in 2003

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Community-based planning (Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership proposal adopted by BLM as preferred alternative) and citizen-based implementation of the plan, including an adaptive management component.

Project's Population Focus – Primarily urban: participating communities include Sonoita, Elgin, Patagonia, Huachuca City, Sierra Vista, Nogales, Tucson and Phoenix

Project Background – In 1995 the Bureau of Land Management decided to take a collaborative approach to planning for the Empire-Cienegas planning area. The 170,558-acre planning area encompasses 49,000 acres of Public Lands which in December 2000 would become the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area. The collaborative effort resulted in the formation of the Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership, a voluntary association of federal, state and local agencies and communities, organizations, and people who share a common interest in the future of land resources in the Sonoita Valley. Members include the communities of Sonoita, Elgin, Patagonia, Huachuca City, Sierra Vista, Nogales, Tucson and Phoenix; the National Forest Service, BLM, National Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Geological Survey, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Arizona State Land Department, Pima County Parks and Recreation and planning and Flood control, and Santa Cruz County as well as numerous special interest groups and private citizens. The planning area is experiencing many complex issues associated with the rapid growth of smaller southeast Arizona communities and the urban influences of the Tucson area. Culture clashes and resource conflicts are occurring more frequently as outdoor recreationists increasingly utilize the area. The planning partnership met monthly for four years working with BLM to develop alternatives which were presented in the fall of 2002 in the Draft Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. The Plan received only one protest, from the Center for Biological Diversity, displaying unprecedented, wide-ranging support from public land users. The success of the planning effort has become regionally famous and hence has garnered strong political support from both parties. It is expected that the protest from the Center for Biological Diversity will be dismissed in the next few months, setting the stage for implementation of the plan.

Project Description – Las Cienegas NCA is a success story for community-based, consensus planning of BLM lands and land use. Not only did a bottom-up community-based effort, in partnership with BLM and other state and federal agencies, formulate the preferred alternative for management of the NCA, but the final plan is proving itself largely immune to substantive challenge – an indication of broad support for its goals and the strength and ability of community-based plans to minimize appeals and litigation. The next stage of the planning effort is implementation of the plan's provisions and activities, utilizing, in part, an adaptive management component. BLM and the Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership seek to extend and institutionalize the collaborative effort that completed the difficult planning phase and extend it to citizen implementation of the plan. Because the plan is highly visible, enjoys wide support, and is a priority for BLM Arizona, the project's probability of success is high. Development of an implementation schedule and finding and securing collaborative methods of funding the citizen-participant projects will be the focus of the Las Cienegas NCA project.

The Sonoran Institute is also working in cooperation with BLM and the Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership. It submitted to the Working Group an addendum to the BLM's project description for the Las Cienegas NCA project.

**Sonoran Institute Project Addendum**

In 2000, along with our community partners, the Sonoran Institute was instrumental in securing establishment of the 142,000-acre Las Cienegas National Conservation Area, protecting the large tract of native grasslands and lowland corridor in the region. We subsequently worked on the creation of a stakeholder-driven management plan for Las Cienegas NCA that includes an adaptive, management and monitoring component.

### Sonoran Institute Project Addendum Con't

However, when Las Cienegas was created, approximately 50,000 acres at the north end of the watershed were left out of the initial federal designation (the "missing link"). Although these lands link the NCA to national park and forest lands in the Rincon Mountains east of Tucson, they comprise a mix of state, county, and private lands, which raised concerns in the Arizona State Land Department about how they would be acquired and managed. The NCA legislation required that the Secretary of the Interior submit a report to Congress within two years that describes "the most effective measures to protect these lands".

The Sonoran Institute has spent the last 15 months developing the protection strategy, in partnership with the US Bureau of Land Management and National Park Service. What remains to be completed is to implement the strategy for protecting the "missing link" in the next two years and ensure that management of Las Cienegas National Conservation Area continues to protect its biological and recreational values through its stakeholder process, the Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership.

We envision an ad-hoc organization with a governing board comprised of land managers, landowners, and local stakeholders including ranchers, recreationists, and other land users. Similar collaborative management areas through the West include: Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Area in Oregon; the Blackfoot Challenge in Montana; and the Valles Caldera National Preserve in New Mexico. This approach works particularly well in areas like the "missing link" where there are multiple federal, state, and county land owners/managers; diverse private landowners; and pressure from development and recreation.

**Barriers and Other Considerations** – The Las Cienegas NCA project has or will incorporate many of the most innovative and citizen-based 4 C's tools available to the BLM, including: consensus-based community planning (designating the community proposal as the BLM preferred alternative in NEPA documentation), citizen implementation of the plan, and an adaptive management framework and strategy for plan implementation. Innovation can attract appeals and litigation, as it has in the Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project. However, the attention given to citizen participation upfront in the Las Cienegas NCA planning process will largely insulate these 4 C's innovations from pre-emptive challenge.

**Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution** – Broad participation of the public in the implementation of the Las Cienegas plan within an adaptive management framework; potential model for planning and plan implementation on other units of the National Land Conservation System.

### **Community-Based 4 C's Partnerships and Agreements**

#### **(11) Moab, Utah, Community Collaboration Project**

**Project Highlight** – Comprehensive integration and coordination of Moab community-based projects for collaborative management of surrounding public lands irrespective of jurisdiction.

**Project Location** – Southeastern Utah

**Project Status** – Individual components of the project are being implemented; comprehensive integration and coordination of those projects for seamless collaborative management of public lands surrounding the Moab community – *the goal of the Moab, Utah, Community Collaboration Project* -- is a conceptual proposal presented to the Working Group for consideration.

**Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations** – The individual components of the project utilize a variety of partnerships, inter-agency cooperative agreements and cooperative management agreements for implementation. Further development and application of partnerships and

agreements, and related 4 C's tools, would be pursued in the implementation of the project.

Project's Population Focus – Mix of rural and urban interests; city of Moab, urban and regional recreational users, and residents and land users in the area surrounding Moab.

Project Background – Moab is home to a number of successful interagency, intergovernmental and public-private partnerships between the federal agencies, state, city, county and non-profit organizations. To date, however, there has been no concerted attempt to coordinate these partnerships to achieve a more comprehensive and collaborative management of the public lands surrounding Moab. However, such management would enhance individual partnerships and provide a more effective way to address cross-jurisdiction management of land and resources, better advancing the goals of the 4 C's and the principles of citizen-based stewardship. Among the individual partnership/cooperative agreement projects now underway in Moab, Utah, the following are notable for their contributions to stewardship partnerships between the BLM and local government, citizen groups and individual citizens:

- *Moab Information Center* — Currently, the Moab Information Center (MIC) is a joint effort of the Grand County Travel Council, the Canyonlands Natural History Association, and the Moab Offices of the BLM, National Park Service, and Forest Service. The facility is located in downtown Moab and is known for its innovative financing, ownership and management. Grand County purchased the property and funded 90% of construction costs with a 20-year low interest loan from the Utah Permanent Community Impact Board. The loan is being repaid from a portion of the county transient room tax collected from visitors. Additional development costs were funded by a Congressional appropriation to the BLM representing the three federal agencies. The appropriation covered a small portion of construction costs, the design and fabrication of the temporary and permanent exhibits, the purchase of auditorium audio-visual equipment, and the production of Painted Landscapes, the main visitor orientation video program. Grand County leases the building to the Canyonlands Natural History Association. The Association is responsible for insurance, facility, grounds and routine maintenance of the facility. These costs are entirely paid for through profits from the sale of books, maps, and other sales items at the MIC bookstore. An inter-agency board consisting of one representative from each agency oversees operation of the MIC. The Center was established in 1994 through an inter-agency cooperative agreement modeled on the USFS Participating Agreement. A Challenge Cost share grant covers BLM's cost for annual services provided at the MIC.
- *Sand Flats Recreation Area* -- The Sand Flats Recreation Area is home to the one of the world premier mountain biking trails. Over the last two decades, the Slickrock Bike Trail has become a nationally recognized recreation opportunity and has witnessed skyrocketing recreation use. The area's visitor facilities were woefully inadequate and soils and vegetation around the area's numerous undeveloped campsites were deteriorating. As tourism is the key component of Grand County's economy, both Grand County and the BLM recognized the importance of maintaining the Slickrock Bike Trail and the surrounding Sand Flats area as a quality destination area. To provide the level of management needed to maintain Slickrock bike trail as a quality designation area, Grand County and BLM now operate the area under a cooperative management agreement. By using the agreement as an operational framework and by exercising fee-demo authority, the arrangement allows the county to collect recreation use fees and

expend them on recreation management in the Sand Flats Recreation Area. A Citizens Stewardship Committee, established by the cooperative agreement, advises the county on establishing fees and the use of the fees collected. Staffing for the Sands Flats Recreation Area is funded by an AmeriCorps grant and collected fee revenues.

Project Description – The City of Moab, Utah, and surrounding Grand County offer an excellent opportunity to demonstrate a collaborative 4 C’s approach to federal land management in concert with local interests. The proposed Moab Community Collaboration Project would build on existing partnerships to facilitate and establish a comprehensive and coordinated land management effort. The initiative, when implemented, would provide seamless and collaborative management of all public lands) irrespective of jurisdiction) surrounding the Moab community.

Because Grand County is heavily dependent on recreation and tourism, managing visitor use and preserving the natural resources that attract visitors are high priorities both for the community and for its visitors. In recent years, Grand County and non-profit organizations have been able to generate revenue, collect fees and manage routine operations of a visitor center, trails and camping areas by working in coordination with the BLM and other federal agencies. This partnership has allowed the agencies, county and other visitor service organizations to meet visitor expectations, maintain the environment, and to do so entirely through fee collections.

A formal partnership for coordination of existing partnerships and agreements across land management jurisdictional lines – as proposed in this project – could:

- Review opportunities to increase collaboration on a regional scale;
- Develop alternative options for coordinated management of visitors, visitor services and tourism; and
- Generate grass roots dialogue and evaluate benefits from potential administrative, executive or congressional designations that would give the area heightened recognition for its regional and nationally significant recreation and natural resources.

Barriers and Other Considerations – None

Expected Principal 4 C’s Contribution – Integration of existing individual 4 C’s projects to provide collaborative management for all public lands in the Moab area, to enhance the community’s standing as a destination point for tourism, and to ensure more comprehensive, higher quality and more consistent service to visitors.

## **(12) Bluff, Utah – A Proposed Sonoran Institute Project**

**Project Highlight** – Sonoran Institute-Bluff-BLM partnership to protect open space & foster conservation by members of the local community.

Project Location – Southeastern corner of Utah

Project Status – Proposed by Sonoran Institute to the 4 C’s Working Group; some elements of the proposal – *those independent of public lands* – are in the early states of implementation.

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Federal and local plan coordination for consistency and various partnerships and cooperative agreements fro community involvement in conservation initiatives affecting public lands

Project's Population Focus – Primarily Rural; local government and farming and ranching interests

Project Background – As part of the Sonoran Institute's mission to develop and promote new approaches to community stewardship, the Institute has been working with residents of Bluff, Utah, a small community of roughly 300 people in the southeastern corner of the state. Members of the Bluff Historic Preservation Association (BHPA) invited the Sonoran Institute to assist their ongoing efforts at community-based conservation. The Institute is particularly excited to be involved with BHPA because of its commitment to protect the local community from the worst effects of growth, create a shared vision of the future based on local values, and plan for environmental and economic sustainability.

Bluff sits at the confluence of the San Juan River and Cottonwood Wash. The Navaho Reservation is located just south of Bluff on the southern shore of the San Juan River. Lands surrounding the community include public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management and state trust lands managed by the State of Utah. Bluff was founded by the Hole-in-the-Rock expedition in the 1880 and was the first Mormon settlement southeast of the Colorado River. Until recently, Bluff has been a small ranching and agricultural community.

Project Description – Bluff is a growing destination for tourists, second-home buyers, and urban refugees looking for a more relaxed pace of life and scenic beauty. New growth promises to add vitality to the community, but in the absence of effective planning it could also stress existing community ties, contribute to adverse environmental impacts (e.g., ground water contamination), lead to vulnerable economic growth (e.g., lack of diversification), and overwhelm existing governance (e.g., lack of land use planning).

The Sonoran Institute is helping BHPA to expand on several early success stories, which include the creation of a downtown historic district, preservation of a twelfth-century Anasazi Great House and nineteenth-century Pioneer cemetery, establishment of a conservation easement to protect Calf Canyon on the north side on town, and successful protection from subdivision of the Curtis Jones Farm as a working agricultural operation (the last remaining working farm in Bluff).

The Institute is now providing assistance in several areas, including strategic planning, grant writing, workshop sponsorship, and technical advice. Proposed or ongoing projects include:

- § Expand the Bluff Nature Preserve, in partnership with the Bureau of Land Management, to protect a fragile riparian ecosystem along the San Juan River from development, and build a trail system with interpretive sites.
- § Research renewable, small-scale wastewater treatment and solid waste disposal alternatives.
- § Arrange to purchase the development rights to the Cottonwood Wash, a critical north-south corridor of biological diversity and archeological treasures on the northwest edge of town.
- § Adopt land use planning tools to handle growth pressures, especially low-density sprawl

that threatens agricultural lands, riparian areas, and scenic bluffs.

§ Plan for sustainable economic development in an area dominated by public lands and in danger of becoming overly dependent on tourism.

A successful outcome in Bluff will demonstrate the power of community-based conservation and will serve as an example to other communities struggling with related socio-economic changes. Bluff also represents a regionally-significant counterweight to the polarized debate over conservation in southern Utah. Implementation of the project will require a close working partnership with the principal landowner and land manager in the area: the BLM.

Barriers and Other Considerations – None: project may help defuse current conflict over conservation in southern Utah

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Partnerships and agreements between the Institute, the local community and BLM to institute community-driven conservation initiatives in the Bluff area that benefit both the local economy and long-term stewardship needs of private and surrounding public lands.

### **(13) Sandy River Basin Initiative Project**

**Project Highlight** – Assessment and evaluation of success factors in partnerships and related 4 C's tools in Sandy Basin and lessons for their use and application elsewhere.

Project Location – Outskirts of Portland, Oregon, at urban interface.

Project Status – Project is in proposal stage: to evaluate a successful landscape-level partnership between BLM, federal and state agencies, local government and non-profit and citizen groups over past thirty years.

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Evaluation of partnership and related 4C's tools to determine what factors contribute most to successful collaboration and how to use such tools most effectively in the 4 C's Projects Program.

Project's Population Focus – Exclusively urban; federal agencies, state and city of Portland, and cooperating non-profit and citizen groups.

Project Background – The Sandy River is located within 20 minutes drive from downtown Portland, Oregon. Sitting within the urban interface of one of the largest cities on the west side of the Cascade Range, the river and the area provide one of the most valuable natural areas of the country, exhibiting significant faunal, floral, and topographic diversity. The river originates on the glacial and snow-covered flanks of Mount Hood, at 11,235 feet Oregon's highest mountain. From Mount Hood, the river flows 55 miles west and north to its confluence with the Columbia River near Troutdale, Oregon. In this relatively short distance, the river descends over 6,000 feet, flowing through alpine meadows, steep and densely forested canyons, and deep gorges before winding its way to the Columbia. The Sandy meets the Columbia at the west end of the Columbia River Gorge, an unusual and spectacular physiographic feature that has had a major effect on the biotic diversity of the area. Carving a near-sea level route through the Cascade Range, the Columbia is a primary factor in the area's rich natural and cultural history.

The Sandy River watershed provides critical habitat for both wildlife and salmon fisheries. The area provides important open space and recreation opportunities for this rapidly growing urban area. It also contains the Bull Run River, Portland's major municipal water source so pure that it is the Country's only major city water source that is untreated. About half of the river segments in the basin are designated components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System managed by the BLM and Forest Service in partnership with private partners and state and local governments. The basin is also home to the BLM's only nationally designated Scenic area - the Mt Hood National Scenic Corridor.

Project Description – The Sandy River Basin 4 C's Project is not an action initiative; unlike the other projects described elsewhere in the report, it would afford a unique opportunity to highlight, assess and evaluate a very successful and long-term public/private partnership in landscape level resource management. An in-depth analysis of the project and its life cycle stages would allow the BLM to identify and determine what factors lead to the long-term success of a landscape-level project and how productive and stable collaborative partnerships mature, grow and can be sustained over time. This effort would focus on assessing the life cycle or stages of the partnership and help determine the factors, authorities, tools and mechanisms that were and are still critical to its success. As an evaluative effort, the Sandy river Basin Initiative would help the Bureau hone 4 C's tools for implementation elsewhere on public lands and better ensure implementation of partnership arrangements that are most consistent with and supportive of the Secretary's 4 C's agenda.

The partnership, in one form or another, has been in place for over 30 years and has involved dozens of agencies and organizations. The need, authority and opportunity to cooperatively and collaboratively manage the resources of the basin has been driven by a host of political, economic and natural resource issues such as special designations, species listings and habitat restoration (salmon, spotted owl), hydro power re-licensing, municipal water source protection and development, open space protection, land use planning, recreation management and other issues. The partnership has continued to have heavy but balanced involvement from the Federal agencies, a variety of state agencies, two counties, the cities of Portland, Troutdale and Sandy, non-profit conservation organizations such as the Nature Conservancy and River Network, and a multitude of interest groups, concerned private citizens and educational organizations.

The partnership has generated dozens of large scale, cooperatively implemented projects over the years including: the nationally recognized Cascade Streamwatch stewardship education project and interpretive facility, large-scale riparian habitat restoration projects, one of the west coast's most extensive LWCF acquisition and multi-organization open space/habitat protection projects, and the first decommissioning and removal of a dam in the Northwest.

Barriers and Other Considerations – None

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Lessons on partnerships and similar collaborative tools to advance the effectiveness of the 4 C's Projects Program.

#### **(14) Expansion of the Western Colorado Counties' Data Sharing Project**

**Project Highlight** – Collaborative effort by BLM, local governments and citizen groups to integrate and standardize data for more effective planning and community participation.

Project Location – Started in western Colorado, principally Delta and Mesa Counties

Project Status – Implemented in western Colorado; underway in Montana, Florida and North Carolina

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Collaborative data-sharing partnerships with county governments to provide citizens, private industry, local government and federal agencies with access to more and better information for more effective and better informed land-use planning and land management decision-making.

Project's Population Focus – Primarily rural at start; Initial focus on rural counties where data resources for land planning and management are poorly developed or not readily accessible; applicable, however, to all levels of government and demographic situations

Project Background – BLM is using the Geographic Coordinate Data Base (GCDB) Initiative of its Cadastral Survey Program to standardize, integrate and share land records' data in collaboration with county, state, federal and tribal government organizations as well as private industry. One successful example of this effort is BLM's partnership with Mesa, Delta and other counties in western Colorado to standardize the boundary, title and ownership information used by decision-makers in all government organizations and private industry. These pilot efforts serve to integrate data from various sources and allow government organizations as well as private industry and the general public to retrieve comprehensive views of ownership and rights information. Consequently, no matter where the information originates, a user will be able to retrieve and combine it into a single, comprehensive view of title, rights and authorizations on the land. Similar projects have been initiated in Montana, Florida and North Carolina.

Project Description – Data sharing is proving to be extremely effective and useful to BLM and its partners. This project would expand the application of GCDB in partnership with all levels of state and local government throughout the West.

Collaborating with states, counties and other organizations to integrate and standardize data will allow BLM and its partners to access and assemble comprehensive sets of land records data regardless of where it is stored or maintained. States and local governments such as Montana are using GCDB as a foundation to build and maintain their parcel based data sets for 911 emergency response, taxation, assessment, economic development, open space, and flood insurance mapping. BLM, in turn, is beginning to use county and private ownership data such as property assessment, building and structural data, roof types, and well information for energy and mineral leasing, fire planning and response, recreation, and environmental assessment.

The Western Governors Association has noted that cadastral data is critical for maintaining livable communities, encouraging economic development, and developing the tools that give community leaders the ability to manage both. The western Governors state that cadastral information must transcend administrative boundaries if management issues in the West are to be effectively addressed. They believe GCDB is the best means by which to standardize cadastral information and make it universally available. Standardization will foster information sharing and make more comprehensive sets of data available from collective data storage to land managers and community leaders. The information garnered from these efforts will be used to improve how work is approached and conducted in other areas.

Barriers and Other Considerations – None

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Community and local government access to information and data essential to effective citizen-based planning and management on public lands and adjacent private and state lands.

### **(15) New Mexico Native Plant Project**

**Project Highlight** – Community-based native seed production to meet mandate of National Fire Plan

Project Location – San Miguel and Mora Counties, northern New Mexico

Project Status – Early implementation stage

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Agreement between BLM and rural agricultural and development association to (1) provide native seed stock to BLM for land restoration and rehabilitation and (2) provide rural economic development opportunity in northern New Mexico.

Project's Population Focus – Exclusively rural farmers (Adelante Resource Conservation and Development Council – RC&D)

Project Background – The National Fire Implementation Plan directed and funded the BLM to develop a long-term program to manage and supply native plant materials for use in land rehabilitation and restoration efforts. A traditional response to similar national mandates has been to initiate a new program to develop the mandated materials or services (often using only BLM facilities and agency resources) with an accompanying demand to substantially increase agency staff. Typically this requires BLM to expand its mission beyond its expertise, often resulting in sub-standard performance and outcomes. Moreover, whatever benefits are generated by the new program rarely accrue to local resource-dependent communities that could apply them to sustainable economic development and long-term resource stewardship.

Project Description – BLM NMSO is taking the National Fire Implementation mandate in a new community-based direction. It is working with local entities to increase the availability of native plant materials, decrease purchase costs to BLM, and provide a rural economic development opportunity. Specifically, BLM NMSO has created an Agreement with the Adelante Resource Conservation and Development Council (RC&D) to enroll local growers to propagate and clean certifiable native seed. The project has been initiated in San Miguel and Mora Counties, New Mexico. Mora County, which has a strong agricultural history, is the 3<sup>rd</sup> most impoverished county in the U.S. Another break from traditional program development is that the RC&D will assume responsibility for growing program funding and exporting the program to other New Mexico communities and ecosystems – a key dimension to the New Mexico Native Plant Project.

The Agreement leverages resources and in-kind contributions from a variety of sources and is expected to attract major funding from grants and Foundations. For example, technical assistance in species selection, field preparation, certification standards, and design of pilot plots are available without charge to the project through RC&D's existing relationships with the

USDA Plant Material Center and New Mexico State University. Local growers, who are fully aware of the experimental nature of the project, will commit time, labor, land, and water to the effort while technical assistance and field plowing, treatment, and preparation are provided to them by the Agreement. Additionally, the RC&D will pursue relationships with seed companies to create and sustain a competitive native plant market.

People in the area and the BLM NMSO are developing a vision about what the project could mean to the economic future of these communities and others throughout New Mexico, and the project's conservation implications for BLM's ability to restore public lands with native plants. Although impoverished, these counties have many assets and strengths, not least of which are a strong agricultural traditions and local values that support community-based enterprises and healthy lands. The intent of the project is to build a partnership between BLM and local farmers that will make surrounding rural communities essential contributors to the long-term stewardship of public lands. Moreover, the coalition that is being developed between BLM and local residents for this project will likely open multiple non-federal funding avenues and foster a new cooperative, sustainable economic development in which equipment, cleaning facilities, and storage space will be "cost-effectively" shared by community members.

Barriers and Other Considerations – Initial start-up funding will be needed from the federal government. Subsequent long-term funding will be required from alternative sources to ensure the project's long-term sustainability.

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Local farming communities providing native plant material resources that are needed for long-term rangeland restoration and rehabilitation.

## **(16) Outside Las Vegas Project**

**Project Highlight** – Assessment and evaluation of the applicability of Outside Las Vegas' 4 C's model and tools to western communities beyond Las Vegas, Nevada.

Project Location – Federal lands surrounding Las Vegas, Nevada, including: Bureau of Land Management's Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area to the west; the National Park Service's Lake Mead National Recreation Area to the east; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Desert National Wildlife complex to the north; and the U.S. Forest Service's Spring Mountain National Recreation Area to the west.

Project Status – Outside Las Vegas has been operational for four years; the assessment and evaluation proposal for Outside Las Vegas is new and only conceptual at this point.

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Assessment and evaluation of the OLV partnership and 4 C's tools and the suitability and transportability of the SNPLA funding mechanism to other areas in the West.

Project's Population Focus – Primarily urban; includes residents in the greater Las Vegas area and outside visitors, many of which come from urban areas.

Project Background – In the mid 1990s, managers from the four public land agencies in the Las Vegas, Nevada, area (Clark County) began meeting informally to discuss mutual concerns. All

of the agencies faced similar problems, such as limited federal staff, increased visitor volume, urban interface complications and a myriad of pressures from the exploding population growth of Clark County. The agencies also faced deteriorating infrastructure, outdated facilities and decreasing budgets. Beyond similar problems, the four agencies recognized they had common goals. They each wanted to enhance the public's understanding and appreciation of federal public lands, acquire more funding and staffing for land management, improve the quality of federal lands, and maintain a high quality of life and recreational experiences for residents and visitors. They also recognized that each agency working alone in the task of trying to acquire and protect resources or create support for its efforts was not viable and, therefore, would not work. The agency managers began to realize that they needed a united effort to develop a level of understanding, appreciation, advocacy and involvement from the business community and local citizens to support the public lands surrounding Las Vegas. Realizing this, the four federal agencies came to the concept of a viable private non-profit foundation (autonomous and free of the political process) that would be strong enough to improve the quality of life for tourists and residents alike and, at the same time, foster a vivid sense of community through dedication to and reliance upon volunteerism. From this vision, The Outside Las Vegas Foundation was born.

The Outside Las Vegas Foundation is a private, non-profit organization whose mission is to promote outdoor recreation and environmental education and advocacy. The organization began as the brainchild of the four federal land managers in the Las Vegas, Nevada, community in 1998. With only about 220 full-time federal employees to manage more than 7 million acres of federal land, the land managers devised a process by which the local Las Vegas business community, environmental groups, and the public-at-large could help deal with the crushing weight of the job. Federal managers understood that they could not possibly do the job alone and needed the help of the local community to protect the natural resources.

The federal land managers brainstormed how to best protect the federal lands, which naturally surround Las Vegas. The business and environmental leaders were invited to the sessions and offered their support. The Outside Las Vegas Foundation was formed in July 2000, with Alan O'Neill named the first Executive Director. O'Neill, the previous manager of the National Park Service's Lake Mead National Recreation Area, brought 30 plus years of natural resource experience to the position.

Supporters of Outside Las Vegas know that the federally managed lands offer an increased quality of life for the citizens and that is one of the main reasons the business community has jumped onboard in support of the venture.

Project Description – The Outside Las Vegas Foundation works hand-in-hand with four core partners – the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the US Forest Service – to provide for the long-term protection and appropriate use of the seven million acres of public lands surrounding Las Vegas, Nevada. In addition, other non-federal partners are represented on the OLV board. As an important part of its mission, OLV seeks to enhance the quality of life in the Las Vegas area for both residents and visitors by enriching the outdoor experience. OLV is recognized as an important forum and tool to establish a collaborative decision-making model for investment in the stewardship of public land resources and the maintenance of recreation amenities that surround the fastest growing community in the nation.

Since its inception four years ago, Outside Las Vegas has begun to implement an anti-litter and illegal dumping campaign and clean-up program; restore native plant and animal habitats; protect natural, historical and archeological sites; and create new trails and maintain those that now exist. In addition, Outside Las Vegas has started an outdoor and environmental education program for southern Nevada.

This fall, Outside Las Vegas received *Forever Earth* - a floating environmental laboratory and learning center at Lake Mead National Recreation Area (NRA). The primary goal of *Forever Earth* is to help support and encourage needed environmental monitoring and study at Lake Mead that leads to improvement and protection of environmental conditions and enhanced understanding and learning by school groups, researchers, and the public.

Another project is the establishment of an environmental education center at Oliver Ranch in the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area. The education center will team up with the Yosemite Institute to provide a diverse education program, which will include not only the local public schools, but also university level research projects from around the United States and, potentially, the world.

The Southern Nevada Public Land Act (SNPLA) passed in October 1998. It provided authority to the BLM to sell at public auction lands within the urban growth boundary of Las Vegas using a coordinated and systematic regional approach. Proceeds from the sale of federal land under the Act are mandated to stay in Nevada, with 5% going to the state school fund, 10% going to the Southern Nevada School authority, and 85% going toward the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands in southern Nevada. The proceeds also can be used to fund capital projects on Federal lands that surround Las Vegas and to develop parks, trails and natural areas. Recent legislation for Clark County expanded the extent of the lands and authorities under SNPLA. That legislation also designated a number of additional special management areas. OLV provides an effective vehicle and collaborative forum to determine regional priorities and to allocate funds generated by SNPLA and the new Clark County legislation.

The Outside Las Vegas Project is proposed as an assessment initiative to evaluate the 4C's partnership and the tools that are its foundation. Specifically, the proposed project would examine the benefits and collaborative elements contained in the partnership and tools, assess the potential application of the SNPLA funding tool and identify the existing legislative authorities for its application in other areas of the West in conjunction with an implementation framework similar to OLV. The combination of unique legislation that provides a dedicated funding source along with OLV's collaborative forum and non-profit status offer an opportunity for the Department to assess the suitability and appropriateness of these 4 C's tools for future projects whose goal is to protect public lands, provide visitor services and amenities, and enhance the quality of life in and around western communities. Such partnerships and tools can foster collaboration on a regional scale, provide the required forum to act collectively to determine a region's priorities, facilitate coordination, and enhance communication for conservation purposes.

Barriers and Other Considerations – Identifying and acquiring funding sources is a principle barrier to more effective implementation of the Outside Las Vegas Project.

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Evaluation and assessment of the performance of OLV and SNPLA and a determination of their suitability and transferability to other regions of the

West.

### (17) Taos Grass Bank Project

**Project Highlight** – Establishment of community grass bank on BLM lands for range improvement; bank managed collaboratively, in partnership between the agency, livestock grazers, and local communities and interests.

Project Location – Northern New Mexico

Project Status – The project is under consideration by the BLM Taos Field Office, in cooperation and consultation with local landowners, community and livestock growers.

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – BLM and local community partnership for collaborative management of a grass bank on BLM lands for range improvement and restoration.

Project's Population Focus – Primarily rural; livestock grazers and their immediate communities.

Project Background – Range improvement and restoration are needed on some of the grazing allotments under the jurisdiction of the Taos Field Office. In many instances, deferring use while restoration efforts are conducted on these allotments for one or more grazing seasons is the optimal prescription to attain range health objectives. However, most permittees in the Taos Field Area cannot afford to defer grazing on their allotments, both because of lost income and the absence of alternative pasturage to maintain their herds during allotment restoration. The establishment of a grass bank is an affordable and practical solution for grazers and the BLM.

Project Description – The Taos Field Office, grazing permittees, and surrounding community partners are evaluating the potential for a project that would allow for continuation of grazing by current permittees while deferring use of their BLM allotment to allow for improvement of range condition for future grazing use.

The project entails creation of a “grass bank” to provide alternative pasturage to ranchers who would like to rest their grazing allotments for range improvement and restoration. The area under consideration is in mixed public/private land ownership. For this reason, private landowners have been involved with BLM and permittees in the discussion of the proposal and have shown a high level of interest and support for the idea. BLM recently signed an agreement with two landowners for joint participation in range improvements *on both private and public* lands in the area under consideration for the “grass bank”. Other neighboring private landowners have expressed an interest in participating in the joint range improvement effort.

Management of the “grass bank” would be completely community-based. It would occur through collaboration between the agency, livestock grazers, and local communities and interests. The concept has received broad support, and workshops and discussion groups have resulted in a well-grounded understanding of the scope and potential for the proposal. One important tool to establish the grass bank currently under consideration is the traditional transfer of permits of currently inactive allotments to “grass bank” applications.

A number of resources are available to the BLM, grazers and the local communities for

implementation of the “grass bank” idea. Taos Field Office personnel have been working with Highlands University to conduct rangeland evaluations and monitoring in the “grass bank” area. The evaluation and monitoring effort involves both University staff and graduate students. Continued participation by the University, its staff and its graduate students can be expected. Moreover, the Taos Field Office is now being assisted in the proposed project area by the Quivera Coalition, an association of ranchers and environmentalists who are dedicated to range conservation and improvement and who have considerable experience in conducting grazing operations under the grass bank concept.

Barriers and Other Considerations – There is no existing guidance or established procedure for this type of permitting; prior efforts have relied on issuance of temporary non-renewable permits on an individual, case by case basis. Cost considerations include up-front funding for necessary range improvements and maintenance requirements on abandoned allotments. Current grazing fees are insufficient to support grazing activities on public land. This would imply additional funding needs for grass banks as well.

Expected Principal 4 C’s Contribution – Community-based “grass” bank collaboratively managed between BLM, grazers and local communities and interests for range restoration and improvement, and stability of grazing as an economic base.

### **(18) Rio Arriba County Project**

**Project Highlight** – Partnership between BLM and local government and communities in Rio Arriba County to coordinate land-use planning and to develop mechanisms to protect valuable agricultural lands from development.

Project Location – Northern New Mexico

Project Status – Planning stage

Project’s Principal 4 C’s Tools/Innovations – Coordinated land-use planning between BLM and local government and exchange of selected BLM lands for conservation easements placed on private bottom farmlands.

Project’s Population Focus – Primarily rural; county and local residents and participation by regional interests, including Sonoran Institute

Project Background – Protecting the culture- Rio Arriba county lies in north-central New Mexico. It has a rich cultural diversity; it was occupied by Pueblo tribes for hundreds of years before the arrival of Europeans. The area was one of the first settled by the Spanish in New Mexico. Today, the county is one of the poorest in a state that ranks among the most impoverished in the nation. Federal land ownership is the highest of any county in New Mexico and includes US Forest Service managed lands, BLM managed lands, and Tribal reservations. One of the major challenges for the residents of the county is to preserve their traditional lifestyle while providing economic opportunities for its population, particularly its youth. Among the traditions that the residents are trying to protect is small family farm agriculture based on acequias (community operated irrigation systems). Conflicting with that tradition is housing development. Residential growth is occurring disproportionately on the rare yet ecologically important and economically productive bottom farmlands within these communities, in large part because of land ownership

patterns. Private lands are the bottom lands most suitable for agriculture; public lands are the majority upland ranges that are, by virtue of soil and water access, unsuitable for cultivation.

Project Description – Rio Arriba County is addressing the threats to traditional agriculture that are resulting from land ownership patterns and residential development. County officials have contracted with the Sonoran Institute to assist them in preparing a draft comprehensive plan, and have done considerable outreach with residents to get input on issues and perspectives for the county's future (Sonoran Institute proposal for Rio Arriba County is included below).

Although the draft comprehensive plan is a county initiative, the Taos Field Office is cooperating with the county commissioners and the planning department in plan preparation to ensure consistency between the County and BLM management plans. This planning partnership has resulted in a creative proposal that meets both the county's goal and the land management objectives of the agency. The proposal would provide land for economic expansion and residential construction while protecting and maintaining the area's valuable farmlands. BLM and the county, in collaboration with the Sonoran Institute, are proposing a conservation easement program – a program that would protect the fertile bottom lands and riparian systems along the streams by means of conservation easements. In exchange for placing voluntary easements on critical farmlands, selected federal lands adjacent to the communities would be transferred to cooperating private property owners for subsequent development. Under this proposal, new communities would be built patterned after traditional ones, but on BLM uplands. Bottom farmlands, in turn, would be protected from development in perpetuity.

#### Sonoran Institute Project Addendum

The Sonoran Institute has helped Rio Arriba County address growth-related issues following attendance of county officials at a land-use training workshop, jointly sponsored by the Sonoran Institute and the National Association of Counties, in 1999. Due to rapid growth at that time, the county had placed a moratorium on development of traditional irrigated agricultural lands. Subsequently, the county began exploring options for where development could occur, while protecting irrigated areas. With the support of the Sonoran Institute, the county held public meetings and brought experts to discuss the range of local protection options. In August 2000, the county passed an agricultural conservation ordinance protecting riparian corridors along the Rio Grande and Rio Chama - the most progressive conservation ordinance in New Mexico.

The Institute is helping the county work toward its first comprehensive plan, which will guide growth and development for the next 30 years. The plan is expected to outline future land protection strategies including the purchase of development rights. The county also will put forward for further exploration a complex land exchange proposal, whereby landowners who place conservation easements on river bottom lands would be eligible to receive development rights on federal lands. The proposal could result in permanent protection of irrigated agricultural lands and riparian areas, while allowing federal lands (approximately 150 acres) to be used directly for community development purposes.

The federal land exchange proposal is based on the assumption that there are federal lands of low or no conservation value which are located close to agricultural settlement in the Lower Rio Chama and Rio Grande valleys and could be candidates for land exchanges. The County and the Institute will meet with public land managers (primarily the US Bureau of Land Management and the New Mexico State Lands Department) to identify lands of low resource value, whose proximity to existing roads and infrastructure and current designation for disposal in BLM planning documents make them appropriate candidates for the proposed easement/development exchange.

In addition to identifying federal lands of low resource value, the Institute is proposing to contract with a planning and design firm to prepare master plans, based on the layout of traditional villages, for the development of federal parcels. This would allow future development of federal lands to closely replicate the more sustainable land-use patterns of traditional Hispanic settlements. Exploring the land exchange proposal would involve the active participation of community leaders, local and national environmental groups, and other stakeholders to ensure

that the proposal enjoys broad support.

**Barriers and Other Considerations** – The BLM currently lacks guidance on exchange of federal lands for conservation easements placed on private lands. NEPA, ESA and archaeological clearance requirements are potential cost barriers to implementation of the land exchanges. Any potential regulatory limitations that may be required on future use of the easements lands are also possible impediments. A further barrier entails possible opposition to federal lands being exchanged for conservation easements with no guaranteed public access.

**Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution** – Consistency between BLM and county land use plans and a working partnership to protect critical bottomlands in project area through conservation easements and public land transfers to allow continued residential and commercial development.

### **(19) Henry Mountains Bison Herd**

**Project Highlight** – Exercise flexibility in grazing permit policy to allow permittees in cooperation with sportsmen groups to shift forage uses between livestock and bison to attain sustainable livestock operations, healthy bison herds, and quality hunting experiences.

**Project Location** – Henry Mountains, southern Utah, north of Lake Powell; three BLM permits: Brinkerhoff, Jackson and Tercero.

**Project Status** – Informally in place through cooperative effort between BLM, permittees, Utah Department of Natural Resources, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Utah's Sportsmen for Habitat and other interested parties; planning amendment underway to address principal need of the project: *flexible grazing permit policies for the Henry Mountains*

**Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations** – Flexible grazing permit policy to allow permittees and sportsmen to cooperate and voluntarily determine allocations of forage for both permitted livestock and free-roaming bison; flexibility includes (1) authorization for sportsmen's groups to acquire grazing permits from permittees willing to sell, and to dedicate those permits to bison forage and habitat and (2) negotiate with permittees to reduce stocking or alter management in a manner that is conducive to sustainable ranching and the health of the Henry Mountains bison herd.

**Project's Population Focus** – Rural ranchers and ranching communities, mostly rural Sportsmen for Habitat, and urban sportsmen and sportsmen's groups in Utah (including non-resident hunters supporting the program through purchase of bison hunting permits)

**Project Background** – The Henry Mountains lie north of Lake Powell, in southern Utah. There are two major grazing allotments on the high elevation summer range of the Henry Mountains (Brinkerhoff and Jackson). In addition, the permittees of these allotments share the adjacent winter range with an exclusively winter-range allotment (Tercero).

In the mid-1940's, a small number of bison were released in the San Rafael desert, north of the Henry Mountains. By the early 1980s, the herd size had expanded to approximately 400 head. Because of grazing competition in the summer range with livestock, the bison began utilizing winter range during the summer months, removing forage essential to the surrounding livestock operations. As a result, a classic multiple-use battle emerged between livestock users and bison

supporters. The former claimed there were too many bison and the latter claimed there were too many cattle. True to conventional thinking, the solution to over-capacity on the Henry Mountains was to either reduce livestock AUMs or cull the bison herd.

Adding complexity to the conflict which continued into the 1990s was the high reputation of the Henry Mountains bison herd among sportsmen in Utah and nationwide. Sixty bison hunting permits are offered annually for the Henry Mountains, with almost 100 applicants for each permit issued through a state-run lottery. The herd is acknowledged for its trophy animals and the high challenge of the hunt due to the rugged terrain of the Henry Mountains.

Sportsmen for Habitat, a Utah-based sportsmen conservation group, took the first step to end the conflict through a voluntary, win-win strategy. It compensated the permittees who had lost forage to bison with \$400,000 in exclusively private funds. In addition, the group provided substantial funding to the Brinkerhoff allotment to assist the permittee in changing his management in a manner that benefited both livestock and bison. Soon afterwards, the permittee on the Jackson allotment indicated a desire to retire from the cattle business. Sportsmen for Habitat bought him out.

All of these initial transactions were completed by the start of the 2002 grazing period. An immediate benefit was that the remaining livestock operations in the Henry Mountains and the resident bison herd thrived well during the summer drought. The bison herd moved into the vacant Jackson allotment, avoiding the critical winter range of Brinkerhoff and Tercero. As a result, there is adequate winter range this winter for both cattle and bison.

Project Description – The Henry Mountains’ partners seek greater flexibility in the use and application of grazing permits. They want the local BLM Field Manager to have the ability to authorize long-term arrangements among voluntary parties for changes in forage allocation. They also seek permit flexibility that will foster and expand ongoing cooperation among an array of public land users for community-driven innovations in the management of public lands for multiple resource uses and values. Current non-use policies and requirements are burdensome and inadequate to provide the flexibility sought by all parties. For the cooperative effort to work and to provide a model for public land conflict resolution and sustainable ranching westwide, the partners require the freedom to transfer permits and permit uses for indefinite periods between livestock and bison in a manner consistent with adaptive management and the needs of the land.

The partners look to the amendment of the Land Use Plan governing the Henry Mountains as an opportunity to address grazing permit flexibility in new and innovative ways – ways made possible by more creative approaches to the amendment process (such as consensus- and community-based planning). They see opportunities provided by the plan amendment to increase the bison herd, increase hunting permits for sportsmen, and provide remaining stockmen in the area with greater forage reserves as grazing competition is resolved through win-win grazing permit transactions. Range conditions, they believe, will greatly improve as a result. In addition, the Henry Mountains’ deer herd will be able to continue its recovery made possible by recent agreements initiated by the Utah Sportsmen for Habitat.

Ultimately, the project seeks to make the Henry Mountains a multiple-use showcase. In lieu of range wars, the partners hope to forge win-win solutions to forage allocation conflicts. With flexible grazing permit policies, the BLM can maintain abundant wildlife, healthy range

conditions, and provide hunting and wildlife viewing opportunities. At the same time, ranchers will be compensated fully *through voluntary negotiations* for any permit changes. Possible economic losses to local communities through reduction in livestock production will be offset by increased tourism and increased employment for hunting guides. In such a dynamic and adaptive environment of voluntary agreements, the BLM and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources will be able to work with ranchers and sportsmen to make livestock operations economically sustainable and wildlife a sustainable part of the local economy.

Barriers and Other Considerations – Current grazing permit policies do not allow permit holders to indefinitely exercise non-livestock use for the benefit of bison. Plan amendments as traditionally constructed can temporarily close allotments to livestock use; they are, however, subject to reversal. Moreover, traditional plan amendments, however temporary, entail regulatory elimination of livestock grazing and the net reduction of BLM lands available for livestock use. The Henry Mountains’ experience suggests that there are non-regulatory options available, assuming favorable and flexible grazing permit policies.

Expected Principal 4 C’s Contribution – New innovations in the application and use of grazing permits that will foster cooperation between and win-win solutions among public land users in community-based multiple-use management.

### Community-Based Programmatic/Institutional Initiatives

#### **(20) Fostering Strong Community Relations and Expertise**

**Project Highlight** – Evaluate the establishment and benefit of community “liaison” staff or coordinators in Key BLM Field Offices in the West as a potential 4 C’s tool; other potential projects to foster strong community relations and expertise.

Project Location – Not Applicable

Project Status – Proposed as concept to the 4 C’s Working Group

Project’s Principal 4 C’s Tools/Innovations – Establishment of community liaison or coordinator staff in BLM Field Offices to foster and facilitate the 4 C’s in general and community-based planning and management on public lands in particular; agency provision of community-based planning and management assistance; community grants program; agency technical outreach to communities to develop expertise in GIS and related planning tools; community collaborative workshops; and urban interface initiative to identify and address critical issues associated with rapidly expanding urban areas.

Project’s Population Focus – Urban and rural, in all western states.

Project Background – The communities of the West are changing. For the foreseeable future, the BLM faces the challenges of explosive population growth in the West, economic shifts, and increased demands for quality experiences on public land. The demands and expectations of “communities of interest” as well as “communities of place” are growing in intensity and diversity. These challenges represent a significant opportunity for BLM to play an expanded and influential role as a leader and partner with local communities as a key component in regional

planning and as a source of technical assistance and collaborative partnership in the delivery of services. BLM managed public lands are quickly becoming *America's backyard* throughout the West. In these areas and among the communities found there, the BLM can directly influence the economic vitality and quality of life of both local citizens and visitors.

In various dialogues with community leaders, local citizens and regional governments, communities repeatedly stressed that they want to be substantively involved in a long-term, productive relationship with the BLM – not only during the planning process but also continuously throughout management implementation. All types of communities are ready and willing to play an active and collaborative part in providing solutions for land management challenges. These communities emphasize that only through enduring mutually beneficial relationships can BLM be successful in sustaining a flow of benefits from the public lands while maintaining the resource quality of the land.

Project Description – Maintaining long-term relations with communities requires fostering internal agency expertise on community issues, partnerships, and collaborative approaches. Having both the knowledge and skills at the field management level is an essential ingredient to sustained cooperation and positive working relations with local communities. The proposed project would evaluate the establishment and benefit of community “liaison” staff or coordinators in key field offices around the West. A number of field offices have already formally identified this role for personnel. Certain offices have cultivated positive, long-term relationships with local communities by having staff that understand and provide expertise in regional land use planning, local government operations, partnerships and grants. These field offices offer an opportunity for the agency to evaluate the effectiveness of the use of this management model. This project would assess benefits and outcomes for those areas where personnel with collaboration and community issue skills have been dedicated and utilized. The project would also evaluate the potential to create community liaison responsibilities as a primary role for existing or new positions within field offices to foster community relations, coordination and collaboration in work areas such as local and regional planning, local and state government operations, non-profit organizations, and community development. Community liaisons would promote and strengthen collaborative partnerships with both communities of place and interest. The project would also assess the skill development, training needs and guidance required to foster this type of expertise within the Bureau and among the communities served by the agency.

Other actions can also be taken by the agency to advance 4 C's goals through community support initiatives. By the nature of its mission and authorizing legislation, BLM is a critical player in supporting and serving communities of both place and interest. As an effective leader, BLM facilitates and participates in developing strong community collaborative relations, serves to resolve urban interface issues, and provides a continued flow of benefits from the public lands to the public.

The BLM has a responsibility to provide, and the potential to facilitate, opportunities for community involvement, collaboration and cooperation in a regional and landscape approach to land use management. As an agency, BLM also has a mission obligation, technical support capabilities, unique realty/land tenure authorities, and an agency-wide understanding of its potential role in connecting people with their landscape and working together with local communities to achieve shared goals. The management of BLM public lands through full and ongoing participation by communities and the interested public has resulted in decisions that have wider support, are of higher quality, and are collaboratively implemented.

Although BLM does need additional resources, many answers to collaborative management and partnered stewardship may lie in coupling and leveraging the agency's resources with those of local communities who oftentimes have a greater stake in seeing the agency's visitor and community services succeed. The following are some of the community collaboration support concepts generated by external and internal constituents and which could be implemented as projects under the 4C's Project's Program:

- **Community Assistance, Support and Service** - Expand BLM's provision of collaborative community-based planning and community assistance programs (such as the National Training Center partnership series) to build and enhance understanding and planning abilities, analysis, fundraising, and conflict resolution capabilities among agency staff and community partners. Examples of other types of programs that BLM could offer are Alternative Dispute Resolution, the Economic Profile systems model for planning developed by the Sonoran Institute and the Share Your Heritage Workshops (in conjunction with state arts' agencies, NEA and NEH).
- **Expanded Funding for Challenge Cost Share Programs that Embrace 4 C's Principles** – Challenge Cost Share provides money or in kind services to joint BLM and community projects. The agency should expand the program to include a *community grants program* or a funding mechanism that is similar to the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service models that are now used to launch shared agency/community initiatives.
- **Develop Outreach Programs to Provide BLM Technical Assistance** – BLM should develop technical training programs for local communities in the areas of GIS, economic/benefits analyses, and coordinated regional planning. Communities that are equipped with such tools will be more prepared to engage in community-based planning and management of public lands and stewardship partnerships with the BLM.
- **Community Collaboration Workshops** – BLM should initiate a series of community or regional forums to determine common interests and goals as a broad scale BLM outreach effort. Such forums could be sponsored by Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) to identify mutually beneficial projects, partnership opportunities, and direction for efforts and actions that move beyond planning toward management implementation, visitor service delivery, and other areas of importance to communities of place and interest.
- **Urban Interface Initiative** - Initiate an *urban interface* task force and interagency network to address the critical issues jointly confronting the rapidly expanding urban areas and the public lands that are now their backyard. The task force would seek viable solutions to mutual concerns such as law enforcement, public security/safety, emergency services, fire control, accessibility, and related urban growth issues.

Barriers and Other Considerations – None

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Creation of new 4 C's tools that can enhance community skills within the agency and better equip communities to engage in community-based planning and management on public lands and partnered stewardship with the BLM.

## (21) Collaborative Planning/Adaptive Management Workshop

**Project Highlight** – Development of a 4 C's collaborative planning and adaptive management workshop for BLM managers.

Project Location – Phoenix National Training Center or Equivalent Location

Project Status – Proposed as a concept within the 4 C's Working Group

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Advance understanding of and skills for implementation of collaborative planning and adaptive management among BLM managers.

Project's Population Focus – Urban and rural.

Project Background – A small but significant number of BLM field managers are making strides in the application of collaborative planning and the implementation of adaptive management on public lands. Both of these initiatives are essential to the success and advancement of the 4 C's within the bureau. Despite these successes in community-based and citizen-centered stewardship, the majority of BLM field managers have not been exposed to or substantially involved with collaborative planning and adaptive management.

Project Description – Collaborative planning and adaptive management have occurred most often in isolation in BLM. To share the wealth of information on, experience from, and creative uses of collaborative planning and adaptive management throughout the BLM, the 4 C's Working Group recommends designing a workshop dedicated to collaborative planning and adaptive management and aimed at BLM field managers. The workshop would highlight a consistent understanding of collaborative planning and adaptive management, innovative approaches to achieving collaborative planning and adaptive management, implementation strategies for collaborative planning and adaptive management, and networking opportunities among managers that have not been available at either a national or regional scale to date.

Topics and educational exercises of particular relevance and interest to the workshop might include (1) a survey of the training packages and materials that are available to field managers to use with partners and (2) guidance and instruction on how to develop networks with the formal and informal leaders of local, county and state organizations. An analysis of skill needs and the appropriate framework/setting for communicating them is required to determine the scope (national or regional) of the workshop to ensure its optimal effectiveness.

Barriers and Other Considerations – None

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Field managers better equipped and more willing to implement collaborative planning and adaptive management; field managers better prepared to work with and train communities in collaborative planning and adaptive management

## (22) BLM National Recreation and Visitor Summit

**Project Highlight** – Convening of a BLM National Recreation and Visitor Summit for a dialogue on collaborative development and implementation of a BLM recreation and visitor services strategy.

Project Location – Location of summit not determined; candidate site is Red Rocks conservation area, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Project Status – Proposed as a concept within the 4 C's Working Group

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Development of a BLM recreation and visitor services strategy that relies on key 4 C's tools such as collaborative working relationships and stakeholder stewardship partnerships with BLM for the purpose of implementation of the strategy.

Project's Population Focus – Urban and rural stakeholders.

Project Background – Recreation use of public lands is eclipsing other uses. Recreation and tourism is transforming the quality of life for western residents and western visitors in ways that are apparent and in ways that are not so apparent. Demographic changes in urban and rural areas of the West highlight the quality of life issue and frame the increasing importance of recreation and the outdoors as a key factor in the current and future growth and development of the West. As recreation-driven growth and expansion occurs, and as tourism mounts, the issues of open space and land conservation take precedence. BLM must develop a national recreation and visitor services strategy to meet its land management mission. That strategy, however, cannot be developed in isolation. Consistent with the 4 C's, the communities of interest engaged in recreation and visitor services must be partners with the BLM in both the development of a national strategic plan and in its implementation.

Project Description – The BLM National Recreation and Visitor Summit would be a BLM sponsored three or four day gathering of key organizations and constituents in a workshop and open-discussion setting to be joined by select DOI representatives and BLM managers. The forum setting would bring together representatives from a broad set of recreation, tourism, industry, and community interests from across the West and Nation for an open dialog about the collaborative development and implementation of a BLM Recreation and Visitor Services Strategy. The summit would allow an opportunity for the BLM to listen to concerns, collaboratively generate ideas, identify broadly supported actions and foster ownership in a comprehensive strategic effort from both communities of place and communities of interest. Such a gathering would allow for enhanced understanding of the issues faced by all parties, identification of shared goals, and generate a framework for continued cooperation on both regional and national scales for collaborative provision of recreation and visitor services on public lands. The session might also generate a framework that supports the Department's Strategic Plan as related to recreation and visitor service.

Goals for the Summit or Forum would include:

- Provide an opportunity for open dialog and collaboration in the development of a BLM

#### Recreation and Visitor Services Strategy at a national level

- Provide public outreach, understanding and awareness of BLM services successes and issues
- § Identify cooperative opportunities and establish needs for enduring partnerships
- Garner and foster support for the agency's cooperative and collaborative approaches to addressing critical management and resource needs and issues

In bringing together key players in the recreation and tourism arena in a collaborative forum, the BLM is providing an opportunity for an open dialog concerning the development of a National Recreation and Visitor Services Strategy for the Bureau – one that has a broad constituency involvement, support, and enlists cooperative partnerships for its implementation. The Recreation and Visitor Summit would offer stakeholders a unique opportunity to hear about and discuss issues related to the development of a comprehensive approach to addressing challenges faced in providing high quality recreation opportunities and visitor services. The meeting would also generate ideas concerning how stakeholders might be involved through collaborative approaches and how BLM can better and more efficiently serve the public and increase visitor and constituent satisfaction through cooperative efforts.

In preparation for the summit, a small group of leaders from national, state and regional recreation and tourism organizations could gather for a pre-summit meeting with key BLM leaders to gauge interest and to discuss opportunities to collaboratively plan and cosponsor the proposed summit. A pre-summit meeting would allow time to vet and refine the concept, and gain support and possible co-sponsorship of a larger, more inclusive and truly collaborative event. It would be possible to conduct this meeting at a western location and include a field trip on BLM land.

#### Barriers and Other Considerations – Funding

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Involvement of stakeholders in both planning and implementation of BLM recreation and visitor services strategy.

### **(23) Taos Centralized Emergency Dispatch**

**Project Highlight** – Establishment of a centralized community dispatch center for enhanced community communication service and direct communication between emergency response organizations.

Project Location – Taos, New Mexico; Taos Field Office

Project Status – Under discussion and consideration

Project's Principal 4 C's Tools/Innovations – Coordination of communications to provide better safety and emergency service to residents of, and visitors to, Taos County.

Project's Population Focus – The communities and residents on lands served by the dispatch centers and emergency services within and adjacent to Taos County.

Project Background – At present there are several organizations within the Taos County area which provide emergency response through separate dispatch offices. This at times delays response, and causes some confusion among the public about what number to call to receive a specific service. For example, under the present system BLM has been unable to consistently communicate between responding vehicles from other agencies when engaged in fire suppression and law enforcement activities. A similar communication failure occurs between some emergency response agencies in responding to emergency calls from the public. In addition, the lack of coordinated dispatch makes direct communication between emergency service responders difficult. Local community leaders have expressed enthusiasm for developing a centralized and coordinated radio communication emergency dispatch that would provide a single point-of -contact and allow direct communication between response organizations. A single dispatch center would go a long way in relieving many of the concerns related to effectiveness and safety voiced by community members and emergency service providers.

Project Description – A centralized radio dispatch is proposed for Taos and Taos County with support from the BLM and other federal agencies. Benefits to the community would be significant. A centralized dispatched would provide more efficient and effective response at a lower cost than the current system of separate and non-coordinated dispatches. Participants could partner in sharing repeater, antenna and other systems capabilities, including coordination and linkages of operating frequencies. A single center would save on cost over the current multiple facility system, in part because of significant savings resulting from decreased staffing requirements. A centralized dispatch would also allow for frequency-coordinated mobile units to allow direct communication by responders.

Barriers and Other Considerations – There is some organizational resistance to sharing of authority, responsibility, equipment and facilities. Also, project could result in decrease in staffing levels and reduction in pay grade for some employees. Startup costs may also be an issue.

Expected Principal 4 C's Contribution – Enhanced emergency service to Taos and the surrounding community through coordination and centralization of communications is anticipated. Lower long-term cost of government services is expected.

## VI. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 4 C's WORKING GROUP

Based on the proposed mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative, the suggested guidance elements, special focus operating criteria and identified barriers and barrier solutions, the Working Group offers the following principal recommendations for establishment and full implementation of the 4 C's Initiative:

- (1) The 4 C's Initiative should be implemented on a systemic basis; its purpose should be to institutionalize, not test, the collaborative and partnership tools of the 4 C's that are already in various stages of implementation within various field offices of the bureau.**
- (2) The 4 C's Initiative in its formal implementation should have a definite sunset provision; its measure of success should be the declining need among BLM managers for its services, the adoption of its principles and tools as the operating condition for business as usual in the bureau, and the institutionalization of its essential functions in agency culture, among agency personnel and within already existing agency offices. Acceptance and broad application of the principles of the initiative should be part of the overall monitoring of program implementation and success, and should determine the need for continuation of the program.**
- (3) Resource Advisory Councils should be an integral component of the 4 C's Initiative, giving advice and oversight in project implementations and providing critical channels for public participation, transparency and reporting.**
- (4) A Coordinator position should be established and filled on a term-appointed basis for overall direction and support of the initiative, and for ongoing coordination with the 4 C's Working Group. The Working Group should be continued for the life of the initiative. Sufficient funding should be budgeted for the Coordinator and the 4 C's Working Group.**
- (5) The Department and the BLM should identify internal funding sources to support implementation of prioritized 4 C's projects and activities at the Field Office level. This could include targeting portions of CCS or CCI funds to 4 C's initiatives.**
- (6) The agency should work with other partner organizations to establish an annual recognition award, starting in 2003, to highlight and acknowledge superior innovation and outstanding achievement among staff and partners in the implementation and advancement of the 4 C's Initiative through collaboration, partnerships, citizen conservation and full community participation in the shared management and stewardship of public lands.**
- (7) Initial focus in the implementation of the 4 C's Initiative should be to identify,**

develop and provide collaborative and community-based training opportunities to partners. Particular attention should be given to the National Training Center Partnership Series. A review should be conducted of the Series for sufficiency in regard to 4 C's related training, and support should be provided to new courses if identified. BLM should work with other organizations who offer 4 C's-type training to complement and augment the Series.

**(8) The agency should take immediate and appropriate actions to ensure the strategic filling of vacating or open field manager positions with candidates having knowledge, skills and abilities in 4 C's related areas as specified in this report.**

## ATTACHMENT ONE

# 4 C's TOOLS OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

### Introduction

The 4 C's – *conservation through cooperation, communication and consultation* – constitute the policy framework and operational objective established by the Secretary for the Department's management of lands and resources and its engagement with land owners, land users, local and State governments, tribes and the general public for the purposes of conservation.

Consistent with the Secretary's 4 C's agenda, the Assistant Secretary for Land & Minerals – pursuant to the Memorandum of 10 June 2002 (Appendix I) – requested preparation of a comprehensive paper that would: (1) document existing 4 C's projects and identify the tools used to implement them; (2) explore future pilot projects and develop criteria for their selection and development (Appendix II – McKinney paper); and (3) identify barriers to the development of 4 C's projects and examine how BLM is responding or could respond to them. This paper addresses the first of the three tasks.

### Procedures

A 4 C's task group, comprised of nine members from the BLM and one member from the office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, prepared the paper requested by the Assistant Secretary.<sup>4</sup> As the first step in doing so, the task group focused on collecting a sufficiently large and significant sample of 4 C's projects from which to identify and extract the primary tools – *or administrative means* – by which the most innovative 4 C's projects in the BLM were structured and implemented. The sample of 4 C's projects is listed in Appendix III.

The task group recognized that all subsequent steps in the development of a 4 C's pilot project program would build from the foundation set by (1) currently available 4 C's tools, (2) new uses of existing 4 C's tools, and, ultimately, (3) the ability of innovative managers within the bureau to develop and implement new 4 C's tools. Those tools would determine the operational landscape for 4 C's experimentation in citizen-based stewardship. Accordingly, the sense of the task group was to issue this preliminary classification of 4 C's tools in advance of the more comprehensive document requested by the Secretary. An initial topology of 4 C's possibilities was deemed

---

<sup>2</sup> Members of the 4 C's task group are: **Bob Abbey**, Nevada State Director (775-861-6590, [Bob\\_Abbey@nv.blm.gov](mailto:Bob_Abbey@nv.blm.gov)), **Ann Aldrich**, Group Manager, Planning (202-452-7722, [Ann\\_B\\_Aldrich@blm.gov](mailto:Ann_B_Aldrich@blm.gov)), **Elena Daly**, Director, National Landscape Conservation System (202-208-3516, [Elena\\_Daly@blm.gov](mailto:Elena_Daly@blm.gov)), **Tom Dyer**, Field Manager, Burns, OR, (541-573-4422, [Thomas\\_Dyer@or.blm.gov](mailto:Thomas_Dyer@or.blm.gov)), **Karl Hess**, Advisor to the Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget (202-208-1378, [Karl\\_Hess@ios.doi.gov](mailto:Karl_Hess@ios.doi.gov)), **Ron Huntsinger**, Field Manager, Taos, NM (505-751-4700, [Ron\\_Huntsinger@nm.blm.gov](mailto:Ron_Huntsinger@nm.blm.gov)), **Kit Kimball**, Director of Inter-Governmental and External Affairs (202-208-1923, [Kit\\_Kimball@ios.doi.gov](mailto:Kit_Kimball@ios.doi.gov)), **Cynthia Moses-Nedd**, NACo Liaison (202-452-5114, [Cynthia\\_Moses-Nedd@blm.gov](mailto:Cynthia_Moses-Nedd@blm.gov)), **Bob Ratcliffe**, Deputy Group Manager, Recreation and Visitor Services (202-452-5040, [Bob\\_Ratcliffe@blm.gov](mailto:Bob_Ratcliffe@blm.gov)), **Mike Taylor**, Arizona Deputy State Director (602-417-9230, [Michael\\_Taylor@az.blm.gov](mailto:Michael_Taylor@az.blm.gov)), **Richard Whitley**, NM Assistant State Director (505-438-7501, [Richard\\_Whitley@nm.blm.gov](mailto:Richard_Whitley@nm.blm.gov)).

essential in order to advance to the subsequent steps of determining project criteria, selecting appropriate 4 C's projects and identifying and rectifying project barriers. Understanding the constellation of available 4 C's tools – whether in place or conceivable on the near-horizon – is instrumental to the program's direction, content and performance outcomes.

## **Findings**

The preliminary classification of 4 C's tools is summarized at the end of this overview, in the 4 C's tools summary matrix. A detailed and illustrated account of those tools follows in the main body of the text: *4 C's Tools – A Preliminary Classification*. In all, 26- tools are identified. They include:

- *Planning Tools* – Tools that provide for direct public input into the planning process (Community-Based Planning) or provide for agency adoption of community proposals as the preferred alternative in the NEPA process (Consensus-Based Community Planning)
- *Management Tools* – Tools that structure working relationships between BLM and outside parties for cooperative management and provision of services on Federal lands (Agreements), establish formal management agreements between BLM and non-Federal entities (Contracts), augment BLM management capability on Federal lands (Volunteer and Cooperative Partnerships), provide for ownership options under special circumstances (Ownership Transfer to non-profit or other non-federal entities) and expand the role of the private sector in the management of Federal lands (Land and Recreation leases)
- *Public Participation in Resolving Public Land Management Issues* – Tools that provide a framework for outcome-based management on Federal lands, involving hands-on citizen management and stewardship (Outcome-Based/Adaptive Management) and foster a cooperative framework for resolving public land issues across multiple ownership jurisdictions (Collaborative/Coordinated Partnerships)
- *Education/Interpretation Tools* – Tools that foster public inclusion in BLM educational and interpretive activities (Directed Public Participation and Involvement), facilitate agency and public access to and use of information (Technology, Information and Data Sharing) and provide agency and public training, skills development and capacity building in community-based partnerships (4 C's Agency and Public Training)
- *Advisory Tools* – Tools that establish special public committees to address public land issues (Special FACA Advisory Committees), provide formal advice and consultation to BLM (Resource Advisory Councils), use BLM public meetings and other public forums for advice and support on management actions (Public Meetings for Consultation) and facilitate informal discussions between the agency and community/interest groups regarding land management issues (Non-FACA Information Gathering)
- *Inter-Agency Coordination and Cooperation* – Tools that rely on legislatively-authorized collaborative partnerships between BLM and USFS (Service First), provide more efficient and effective delivery of government services (Consolidation of Bureau Functions), establish agreements and partnerships between multiple agencies to foster more effective Federal land management (Inter-Agency and Multi-Agency Coordination and Cooperation) and allow for creation and use of non-federal entities to provide services that cannot otherwise be performed by the bureau alone or in coordination with other agencies (Inter-Agency Sponsorship of Autonomous Organizations)
- *Alternative Funding Tools* – Tools that provide alternative funding sources that can be used to leverage and encourage collaboration and entrepreneurial 4 C's efforts.

## **Preliminary Observations**

The 4 C's tools described in this report are a sample of a larger universe of existing, proposed and yet to be determined tools. Those that have been identified point to the administrative potential available to bureau managers in the pursuit and implementation of the Secretary's 4 C's agenda. Considered individually and collectively, these tools delineate a space for innovation and creativity that can make land users in particular and citizens in general effective forces in the future planning, management and stewardship of bureau lands and resources.

Existing tools provide the opportunity for citizens to become a formative force in land use planning. Existing tools create the mechanism to engage citizens in management of BLM lands, consistent with the agency's non-delegation requirement. Existing tools establish networks of partnerships, education, and information- and technology-access that can transform land users into effective land stewards. Existing tools allow for a proliferation of advisory roles for citizens, engaging them intimately in the care of their public lands. Indeed, the landscape of existing 4 C's tools, even in this preliminary stage of classification, suggests a new and emerging role for citizens in the governance of the bureau's 270 million acres.

Barriers exist to fulfilling the citizen stewardship potential of many of these 4 C's tools. Some barriers are administrative; others are statutory. Yet the greatest barriers are not always the external impediments of policy, rules and law. Existing workloads among agency staff and the need for additional time commitments may prohibit implementation of otherwise innovative projects. The culture of the agency – the willingness of field staff to engage in innovative activities that entail risk – is a major factor in determining the successful implementation of 4 C's tools. For the tools to work, the bureau's field staff must have the incentives and knowledge-base to work for the 4 C's.

There is an immediate need to provide field staff with awareness and guidance on 4 C's tools and the appropriate settings for their use. There is also the need to provide training in the use of 4 C's tools through such bureau opportunities as the National Training Center Partnership Series. These actions are essential not only for the implementation of a 4 C's pilot project program but for the expansion of the 4 C's toolbox. Staff in the field will be the agents who not only creatively extend and broaden the application of existing 4 C's tools to public land issues, but will be the innovators who pioneer new 4 C's tools to better advance the agency's public mission and the public's participation in that mission.

## **Next Steps**

The 4 C's task group will continue to expand and develop the inventory of 4 C's tools. This will be an ongoing process. Simultaneously, the task group is recommending that the 4 C's tools classification be used as the foundation for a comprehensive manual and guidance on 4 C's tools that will assist field managers in the implementation of the 4 C's initiative. Specifically, the manual and guidance will describe the range of 4 C's tools available, their various applications (based on existing bureau projects), considerations for their use, including new applications, and barriers that may be encountered in their implementation – and ways to overcome those barriers.

The task group's immediate goal is to complete the tripartite mission set for it by the Assistant Secretary before Thanksgiving, 2002. Prompt delivery of the final product is necessary for a timely launching of a 4 C's pilot project program, should that be the decision of the Assistant Secretary. Accordingly, the task group will complete the following activities within the suggested time frame:

- Identify and recommend criteria and a framework for a 4 C's pilot project program, considering and addressing issues and points raised by Matthew McKinney (Appendix II)
- Examine and recommend new projects and project proposals for consideration in the 4 C's program
- Identify and analyze barriers to the use of 4 C's tools and the implementation of 4 C's projects, and provide recommendations on how best to overcome those barriers
- Develop preliminary guidance for pilot projects and deliver recommendations for further guidance, including formulation of policy, rulemaking and, if necessary, legislative action.

### 4 C's TOOLS CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY

TOOL CATEGORY	4 C's TOOL	TOOL FUNCTION
<b>Planning</b>	(1) Collaborative Place-Based/ Community-Based Planning	Provides for direct involvement of public in planning process
	(2) Consensus-Based Community Planning and Management	Allows adoption of community proposal as BLM preferred alternative
<b>Management</b>	(3) Agreements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>) Assistance Agreements (AAs)</li> <li>) Memorandums of Understanding and Agreement (MOUs/MOAs)</li> <li>) Cooperative Agreements (CAs)</li> <li>) Cooperative Mgmt Agreements (CMAs)</li> </ul>	Establishes working relationships and sets responsibilities between BLM and outside parties for coordination, management, and provision of services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>) AAs facilitate funding to partners</li> <li>) MOUs/MOAs set policy and working framework</li> <li>) CAs foster cooperation with BLM</li> <li>) CMAs are site specific, long-term</li> </ul>
	(4) Contracts	Creates formal management agreements between BLM and non-Federal entities
	(5) Volunteer Partnerships/Agreements	Augments/expands BLM management capability through non-paid assistance
	(6) Cooperative Partnerships	Augments/expands BLM management capability on Federal lands
	(7) Ownership Transfer to Non-Profit Trust or Other non-Federal Entity	Provides management and ownership option for BLM lands or properties when communities have comparative advantage
	(8) Land Leases and Recreation Leases for Public Purposes	Allows increased role for private sector in management of Federal lands
<b>Public Participation in Resolving Public Land Management Issues</b>	(9) Outcome-Based/Adaptive Management	Provides framework of publicly-set outcome-based standards for land-user practice of adaptive management under place-based BLM/public monitoring and oversight
	(10) Collaborative/Coordinated Partnerships for Resolving Public Land Management Issues	Establishes cooperative/coordinated framework to resolve public land issues across multiple ownership jurisdictions
<b>Education/Interpretation</b>	(11) Directed Public Participation and Involvement	Fosters inclusion of public or public entities in the development of BLM educational and interpretive activities
	(12) Technology, Information and Data Sharing	Facilitates access to and use of information
	(13) 4 C's Agency and Public Training, skills development and capacity building	Provides agency and public training, skills development and capacity building in community-based partnerships
<b>Advisory</b>	(14) Special Advisory Committees (FACA Authorized)	Creates special public committees to address targeted Federal land issues
	(15) Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) and RAC Sub-Groups	Provides advice and consultation to BLM and facilitates public involvement in land planning and management
	(16) Public Meetings for Consultation on Issues and Actions	Allows use of public meetings and other public forums by BLM for input, advice and support on management actions
	(17) Non-FACA Information Gathering	Facilitates use of informal discussions with community and interest groups on agency plans and actions

TOOL CATEGORY	4 C's TOOL	TOOL FUNCTION
<b><i>Inter-Agency Coordination and Cooperation</i></b>	(18) Service First	Legislatively authorizes collaborative partnerships between BLM and FS to enhance land management and provision of services for agency customers
	(19) Consolidation of Bureau Functions	Provides for more effective, consistent and coordinated delivery of government services to agency customers
	(20) Inter-Agency and Multi-Agency Coordination and Cooperation	Establishes agreements and partnerships between multiple agencies to foster more effective Federal land management
	(21) Inter-Agency Sponsorship of Autonomous Non-Profit Foundations and Other Public Service Organizations	Allows for creation and use of non-Federal entities to provide conservation and land management services that cannot be provided by the authorized agencies
<b><i>Alternative Funding</i></b>	(22) Challenge Cost Share Program (23) Land and Water Conservation Fund (24) PILT Funding (25) Fee Demo Funding (26) ISTEAs funding	Multiple existing funding sources that can be used as leveraging tools to encourage collaboration and entrepreneurial 4 C's efforts.

## 4 C's Tools *A Preliminary Classification*

### I. Planning Tools

#### (A) **Tool: Collaborative Place-Based and Community-Based Planning**

**General Application:** Inclusion of public in planning process.

**Range of Applications:**

- Pine Nut Mountains Resource Management Plan Amendment – Inclusion of community in consensus-based development of plan amendment; in progress.
- Colorado Plateau Mountain Bike Trail System – Colorado Plateau Mountain Bike Trail Association (COPMOBA) and BLM worked together to develop regional bike trail plan.
- Jawbone Station and the Friends of Jawbone – Broad-based Friends group (50 interest groups, private citizens and other agencies) started by BLM and now an independent non-profit corporation and active partner in collaborative planning process.
- Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area – At suggestion of the two Resource Advisory Councils involved in the planning area (CA and NV), a subgroup comprised of members of both Councils was created to participate in the collaborative planning process for the NCA; additional collaborative planning teams include State of Nevada and socio-economic team.
- Bradshaw/Agua Fria National Monument Resource Management Plan – Development of new Resource Management Plan utilizing a community-based approach; community leaders participated in Partnership Series *Learning Communities* as first step in preparation for community-based planning.
- Salmon Field Office Community-Based Planning – BLM Field Office is participating with local government and private property owners to development a comprehensive management plan.
- Interim Forest Plan, Nevada County, CA – BLM invited the non-profit Yuba Watershed Institute – made-up of community members and local industry – to work with BLM in developing and implementing a forest management plan.
- Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan – A multi-agency, citizen-led management planning initiative for Pima County Arizona, using multi-agency cooperative agreements to achieve the goal of coordinated resource management.
- Coral Pink Sand Dunes – BLM, FWS, State of Utah, and the Kane County Commission prepared a land-use plan amendment for conservation of the Coral Pink Sand Dunes tiger beetle across land ownerships to successfully avoid listing of the beetle as threatened or endangered.
- Knowlton Travel Plan, Eastern Montana – A sub-group of the eastern Montana Resource Advisory Council was formed to develop a travel management plan for the Knowlton, MT area, a checkerboard of mixed federal, state, and private lands; RAC sub-group worked with landowners, recreationists, and commercial outfitters.
- Galisteo Basin Proposal – Proposal to use community-planning process to develop a comprehensive plan for development within the Galisteo basin, including protection

of open space, cultural resources and other resource values; intended to protect local cultural.

**Considerations:** BLM's new planning manual, released in December 2001, establishes community-based planning as the bureau's preferred process.

**(B) Tool: Consensus-Based Community Planning and Management**

**General Application:** BLM adoption of consensus-based community proposals as the preferred alternatives in the NEPA planning process.

**Range of Applications:**

- Red Hill Council Action Alternative – Red Hill Council generated a community Action Alternative for managing Red Hill recreation area (Roaring Fork Valley, CO); BLM adopted Council action proposals.
- La Cienegas National Conservation Area – BLM adopted consensus-based citizen plan (prepared by La Sonoita Planning Partnership) as preferred alternative for La Cienegas National Conservation Area [La Sonoita planning partnership also instrumental in designation of La Cienegas NCA].

**Considerations:** Revision to Departmental Manual now in progress; facilitates Consensus-Based Community Planning and Management in NEPA process by requiring agencies to adopt consensus-based community plans as the preferred alternatives in NEPA documentation whenever possible.

## II. Management Tools

**(A) Tool: Agreements**

**General Application:** Agreements establish a working relationship between the BLM and other cooperating parties, and set forth the respective responsibilities of each under the terms of the agreement. Activities covered by agreements range from management of resources and facilities to provision of educational and interpretive activities on federal lands. Although these are common tools, the uses to which they can be put are subject to a broad range of innovation. A full description and array of BLM agreements is available at: [www.blm.gov/natacq/tools/ib98100.html](http://www.blm.gov/natacq/tools/ib98100.html). The same information can be found in "Guide to Agreements," Information Bulletin No. 98-100.

**Range of Applications:**

**Assistance Agreements** – Agreements between BLM and non-federal groups to provide financial assistance to those groups (with minimal conditions) for a broad range of activities and products.

- Friends of Yaquina Lighthouse – Through a 1996 assistance agreement, Friends of Yaquina Lighthouses assists BLM on special on-the-ground projects, provision of policy guidance, and maintenance of a shop with interpretive and educational

- materials for the convenience of the public.
- Scappoose Bay Watershed Habitat Improvement – Proposed project for partnered watershed habitat improvement for anadromous fish; partnership between BLM, Scappoose Bay Watershed Council, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, City of St. Helens, Columbia County, Olympic Resources, and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife; funding provided by National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and Challenge Cost Share Program.
  - Campbell Creek Science Center – BLM science education facility staffed by non-profit partner employees and paid from fees collected through fee demo authority (co-management authorized by MOU – see below)
  - Hutton Junior Fisheries Biology Program – Assistance Agreement between BLM and other Federal agencies and the American Fisheries Society for funding of the Hutton Junior Fisheries Biology Program (see below).
  - America's Backyard – An educational partnership campaign undertaken by National Geographic Society, BLM, Public Lands Interpretive Association, and Federal land management agencies to educate Americans about history, values, relevancy and role of Nation's public lands in their daily lives; assistance agreements used to formalize partnership.
  - Leave No Trace – BLM-FS sponsored non-profit organization with agency staff on Board of Directors as "advisors;" provides stewardship education and promotes conservation ethics for recreational land users, specifically OHV enthusiasts; administered through MOUs and assistance agreements.
  - Anasazi Heritage Center – Assistance agreements between BLM, BOR, and FS and numerous non-profit associations for projects, operations and maintenance of the Anasazi Heritage Center – a museum for interpreting the history and culture of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument, Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway, and the Four Corners Region.
  - Public Lands Information Center (Arizona) – BLM entered into an agreement with the Public Lands Interpretive Association to provide one-stop-shopping to public; now includes NPS, FWS, FS, and Arizona Game and Fish.

**Considerations:** None

*Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)/Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)* – MOUs are written agreements between the BLM and another entity(ies) that confirm the use of cooperative policies or procedures to promote mutual endeavors. MOAs establish a framework for cooperation and performance of duties in the management of lands and resources, and in the provision of educational services and interpretation on those lands. Both agreements facilitate volunteer engagement in Federal land projects.

- Red Hill Memorandum of Understanding – MOU between BLM and Red Hill Council (community group) for joint implementation of the recreation plan proposed by the Council and accepted by the BLM.
- Colorado Plateau Mountain Bike Trail System – MOU between Colorado Plateau Mountain Bike Trail Association authorizing COPMOBA to oversee volunteers who provide bike patrols, trail monitoring, free maps, and promotion of responsible use.
- Jawbone Station and the Friends of Jawbone – MOU between BLM and Friends; provides BLM pool of active volunteers; Friends produces user-friendly map for visitors.

- Campbell Creek Science Center – MOU between BLM and 20 partners for the cooperative management of the Campbell Creek Science Center by non-profit employees (Assistance Agreement – see above – provides for money transfers from BLM to partners).
- National Public Lands Day – MOU between National Environmental Education and Training Foundation and Public Lands Foundation and BLM and other Federal, State and local land agencies for systematic involvement of volunteers in agency-identified public land projects in every state, including development of work plans to organize volunteers to achieve desired outcomes.
- Scappoose Bay Watershed Habitat Improved – Proposed project for partnered watershed habitat improvement for anadromous fish; partnership between BLM, Scappoose Bay Watershed Council, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, City of St. Helens, Columbia County, Olympic Resources, and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife; funding provided by National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and Challenge Cost Share Program.
- Campbell Creek Science Center – MOU between BLM and 20 partners for the cooperative management of the Campbell Creek Science Center by non-profit employees (Assistance Agreement – see above – provides for money transfers from BLM to partners).
- Wonderful Outdoor World – MOU between BLM and other federal agencies and non-profit groups and private firms to provide outdoor recreational experience and education to urban youth.
- Hutton Junior Fisheries Biology Program – MOU between BLM, FS, and State Game and Fish agencies to encourage and educate minority students in the fisheries profession; funding from Hutton Program and Challenge Cost Share (administered through an Assistance Agreement with the American Fisheries Society).
- America's Backyard – An educational partnership campaign undertaken by National Geographic Society, BLM, Public Lands Interpretive Association, and Federal land management agencies to educate Americans about history, values, relevancy and role of Nation's public lands in their daily lives; MOUs used to formalize partnership.
- Leave No Trace – BLM-FS sponsored non-profit organization with agency staff on Board of Directors as "advisors;" provides stewardship education and promotes conservation ethics for recreational land users, specifically OHV enthusiasts; administered through MOUs and assistance agreements.
- Tread Lightly! – BLM, FS, NPS, BOR and Corps of Engineers sponsored non-profit organization with agency staff on Board of Directors as "advisors;" establishes and encourages conservation standards and ethics for OHV industry in advertising vehicles and equipment; administered through MOU with Tread Lightly!
- Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration – Series of memoranda of understandings between National Council of the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial (created by National Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation) and BLM, 16 other Federal agencies, 17 Trail State Bicentennial Commissions, 58 Native American Tribes, State Historical Societies, and numerous other institutional partners to educate the American people on the history of Lewis and Clark and to reconnect the public with the American West.
- Small Business Plan Preparation – BLM develop a MOU with the Small Business Administration to provide business plan preparation and other business skills for small businesses located in rural areas – businesses whose interests are strongly influenced by BLM management of outdoor recreation and heritage resources;

project in concept/vision stage.

- Jawbone Station and the Friends of Jawbone – Friends of Jawbone meet monthly to discuss and work on issues related to BLM and the local region.
- Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area – Established Oregon Coast Passport in 1998; a federal and state multi-agency recreation pass and shared revenue pool from sale of passes.
- Anasazi Heritage Center – MOU between BLM, BOR, and FS for projects, operations and maintenance of the Anasazi Heritage Center – a museum for interpreting the history and culture of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument, Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway, and the Four Corners Region.

**Considerations:** MOAs are required where transfer of funds is involved; MOUs used most commonly between BLM and other Federal or State agencies.

*Cooperative Agreements* – Facilitate and encourage cooperation among parties in programs and projects common to multiple agencies and/or non-Federal/State groups.

- Moab Information Center – Joint funding, ownership and management of Moab Visitor Information Center by Grand County Travel Council, Canyonlands Natural History Association, and Moab offices of BLM, NPS, and FS; Inter-agency board made up of one representative from each of the five groups that oversee the operation of the Moab Information Center.
- Wildfire Support Group, Winnemucca Field Office – BLM entered into a cooperative agreement with local area ranchers and concerned citizens to establish the Wildlife Support Group, whose function is to provide early notification of wildfires in outlying areas, quick response initial attack, identification of best access routes to the fire, and local knowledge of private and federal lands being threatened by fire.
- Humboldt County Noxious Weed Management Cooperative Agreement – BLM, state and federal officials, and numerous private citizens entered into a cooperative agreement for noxious weed management in Humboldt County; BLM developed a programmatic EA covering treatment of noxious weeds on public lands administered by BLM.

**Considerations:** None

*Cooperative Management Agreements* – CMAs are site specific agreements used in accordance with management plans for shared on-the-ground management of a specific management area.

- Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument – 1997 joint management agreement between Pueblo de Cochiti and BLM; Pueblo provides staff to help monitor and maintain the monument and to provide customer service; BLM provides law enforcement.
- Moab Information Center Interagency Cooperative Agreement – Canyonlands Natural History Association is responsible for insurance, interior maintenance, grounds maintenance, and routine maintenance of the Center, grounds, parking area, and all utilities – paid from profits from sales at Moab Information Center bookstore.
- Sand Flats Recreation Area – 1996 cooperative management agreement between

- BLM and Grand County, transferring fee collection, fee retention and recreation area maintenance to Grand County, under oversight of Citizens Stewardship Committee.
- Little Sahara and Yuba Reservoir – 1997 cooperative management agreement between BLM and Utah Division of Parks and Recreation (UDPR) authorizing UDPR to assume primary stewardship responsibility and day-to-day management of the Yuba Reservoir facility, including collection, retention and expenditure of user fees.
  - Susanville Depot and the Bizz Johnson Trail – Transfer of ownership of the Susanville Depot and Visitor Center to the local private non-profit Lassen Land and Trails Trust for future management and stewardship; signed 2000 agreement between BLM and the Lassen Land and Trails Trust (LLTT) to authorize and minimally fund the LLTT to cooperatively manage the Bizz Johnson Trail.

**Considerations:** None

**(B) Tool: Contracts**

**General Application:** Entails a more formal arrangement than agreements; provides new means and additional flexibility to BLM to implement management and conservation actions on Federal lands through non-federal parties; contract authority under FLPMA, USC 1737(b) has not been fully developed.

**Range of Applications:**

- Little Sahara and Yuba Reservoir, Utah – Law enforcement contract between Juab County Sheriff and Yuba and Little Sahara for law enforcement services at the two recreational areas.
- Permittee Stewardship Contracts – Proposed in the pending BLM roll-out on 4 C's Options for Administration of BLM Grazing Permits; contracts would provide outcome-based conservation contracts between permittees and BLM for environmental services from permittees in exchange for payment (stewardship grants), flexibility in management and/or potentially-expanded permit tenure.
- Other Stewardship Contracts – Not yet proposed; administrative stewardship contract program under authority of FLPMA to provide similar local economic opportunities in service of conservation.

**Considerations:** Contracts are consistent with Congressional mandate and Administration commitment to use contracts to improve public service.

**(C) Tool: Volunteer Partnerships/Agreements**

**General Application:** BLM use of volunteer partnerships and agreements to augment and expand management capability on Federal lands, including educational and interpretive activities.

**Range of Applications:**

- Black Rock Desert Volunteers – Volunteer assistance to BLM in Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area for data gathering, ground photo-monitoring, road inventory, boundary marking, monitoring of special

- recreation permits, GPS monitoring, and public contact work.
- Lovelock Cave and Lovelock Cave Back Country Byway – BLM worked with local government, associations, Tribes, Nevada Division of Forestry, University of Nevada, Reno for road construction and development of historical displays, interpretive programs, and nature trails etc.
  - Bloody Shins Partnership Information – BLM relied on partnership with local bike shop, the Winnemucca Convention and Visitor's Authority, Rose Creek Honor Camp, civic groups, and individual volunteers to complete the Nevada Bloody Shins Trail System.
  - Paiute and Great Western Trail System – Creation of Paiute Trail Host Program to authorize volunteers to adopt a section of trail and thereby provide minor maintenance, garbage pick-up, trail signing etc.
  - Pompeys Pillar Historical Association – volunteers operate a community outreach education program that brings hands-on history and environmental education to over 3,000 students annually; also operates a sales outlet.
  - Pompeys Pillar National Monument – students from Montana State University School of Architecture contributed to design of Monument interpretative center.
  - Jawbone Station and the Friends of Jawbone – Friends of Jawbone provided design assistance to BLM in construction of the Jawbone Information Center, serving primarily OHV users.

**Considerations:** None

**(D) Tool: Cooperative Partnerships**

**General Application:** BLM use of cooperative partnerships (including Service First agreements between BLM and Forest Service) to augment and expand management capability on Federal lands, including educational services and interpretive activities.

**Range of Applications:**

- Nevada BLM partnership with Nevada developer to facilitate land exchange by sharing staff resources.
- Interim Forest Plan, Nevada County, CA – Upon completion of the community-based forest management plan by BLM and the Yuba Watershed Institute (see above, under planning), the two parties worked together on a number of management projects, the most significant being the reduction of wildfire danger
- Cascade Streamwatch Project – Partnership between BLM, FS, WolfTree, Inc., a non-profit educational organization, and numerous other agencies and private organizations to develop a comprehensive science-based public resource education program, along with an innovative interpretive site, focusing on watersheds and fisheries; uses extensive volunteer services.
- Hospitality Industry Partnership – BLM and FS (cooperating through a Service First Agreement – see below) engage the National and Regional Hotel/Motel Association, the National and Regional Restaurant Association and other National and Regional Travel/Tourism Partners in a program to highlight the BLM's National Landscape Conservation System so as to enhance the public experience, educate the public on conservation behavior, and enhance economic development.

**Considerations:** None.

**(E) Tool: Ownership Transfer to Non-Profit Trust or Other non-Federal Entity**

**General Application:** Option for future management and stewardship of BLM lands or other properties in situations where community resources enjoy a comparative advantage.

**Range of Applications:**

- Susanville Depot and the Bizz Johnson Trail – Transfer of ownership of the Susanville Depot and Visitor Center by the BLM to the local private non-profit Lassen Land and Trails Trust for future management and stewardship

**Considerations:** Is it desirable for the transfer arrangements to include a reversionary clause in case the transferee is unable to fulfill the intent of the initial transfer of ownership? If so, what would BLM do with the returned property? Who pays for upkeep? What is the liability of BLM of a building that may not be maintained? Should these concerns be incorporated in a business plan?

**(F) Tool: Land Leases and Recreation Leases for Public Purposes**

**General Application:** Option for increasing role of private sector in management of Federal lands and expanding or enhancing delivery of services to Federal land customers.

**Range of Applications** – Examples to be provided.

**Considerations:** None.

### III. Public Participation in Resolving Public Land Management Issues

**(A) Tool: Outcome-Based/Adaptive Management**

**General Application:** Involvement of public in setting outcome standards and reliance on user groups to meet standards through adaptive management practices.

**Range of Applications:**

- Elko Field Office – Proposes regulation to provide for citizen groups to define outcomes in planning process, with appropriate environmental sideboards and careful monitoring; key to successful citizen involvement is to give citizens and communities the tools to apply citizen-led solutions to public land issues.
- Las Cienegas National Conservation Area – Preferred alternative (citizen's plan developed by Las Sonoita planning partnership) would formalize Outcome-Based/Adaptive Management for Las Cienegas NCA.
- New Mexico State BLM Office – BLM New Mexico has advanced a proposal for a series of pilot implementations of Outcome-Based/Adaptive Management.

**Considerations:** Revision to Departmental Manual now underway to ensure consistency of Outcome-Based/Adaptive Management with NEPA and to foster its implementation by all Departmental agencies.

**(B) Tool: Collaborative/Coordinated Partnerships for Resolving Public Land Management Issues**

**General Applications:** Collaborative/Coordinated partnerships for resolving public land management issues involving multiple ownership jurisdictions at the landscape level.

**Range of Applications:**

- Northeastern Nevada Stewardship Group, Inc. – A broad-based collaborative group in the Elko Field Office area (BLM and FS on Board of Directors) formed as result of BLM Partnership Series course, funded by BLM and dedicated to science-based resolution of public land issues; sponsors and organizes technological symposia on array of public land policy and management topics; creates pods to work on specific issues and projects, particularly sage grouse and sage grouse management, fire management, OHV use, and recreational use and access; critical in diffusing public land conflict; prepared sagebrush ecosystem management plan for Elko County – one of several plans under umbrella of Nevada Governor’s Sage Grouse strategy.
- Lemhi Model Watershed Project – Partnership between local landowners, communities and agencies to implement habitat improvement projects in the Lemhi Idaho watershed while maintaining current land uses; focused on improving chinook salmon and steelhead trout habitat.
- Partners for Grassland Stewardship – Collaborative partnership (BLM a member) facilitated by North Dakota Consensus Council with goal to (1) manage grasslands for healthy ecosystem to sustain multiple uses and benefits and (2) stabilize and strengthen rural livelihoods and communities in and around grasslands.
- Blackfoot Challenge – Western Montana grass-roots partnership (BLM a Member) to coordinate management of Blackfoot River, its tributaries and adjacent lands so as to conserve and protect the natural resources and rural lifestyle of the Blackfoot River Valley for present and future generations.
- Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project – Landscape restoration project spearheaded by the eastern Nevada Landscape Coalition (BLM a member), a non-profit organization formed to facilitate and support improvement in federal land management through the pooling of Federal agency resources and the creative use of stewardship contracting, partnerships, cooperative agreements, assistance agreements and other 4 C’s tools.
- Applegate Partnership – A standing committee representing diverse interests (including BLM and FS) in southwestern Oregon and providing community input into timber harvesting within the Applegate watershed.
- Upper Klamath Basin Working Group – BLM participates in the congressionally-mandated Klamath Basin Working group, established to address natural resource issues in the upper basin; Oregon BLM and FWS have supported a contract with the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution to assist the working group to reach agreement on a basin-wide ecological restoration plan.
- Abandoned Mine Cleanup: Upper Animas River Watershed, San Juan Mountains,

- Colorado – BLM is a member of The Animas River Stakeholders Group formed in the early 1990s to address acidic toxic metal wastes discharge from abandoned mines in the headwaters of the Animas River.
- Muddy Creek Coordinated Resource Management Project – BLM, Forest Service, the local Conservation District, ranchers and landowners entered into a coordinated resource management project in 1992 covering federal and private lands in Carbon County, southeastern Wyoming. The purpose of the project was to jointly work toward 6 goals: (1) increase cooperation and coordination among land managers, landowners, permittees, and interest groups; (2) improve critical range for key wildlife species; (3) reconcile grazing with non-consumptive land uses; (4) reestablish Colorado River cutthroat trout; (5) better manage uplands for wildlife and livestock; and (6) improve water quality by reducing erosion and sedimentation
  - Heart Mountain Partnerships – BLM, The Nature Conservancy, NRCS staff, Wyoming Game and Fish, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, and Park County Weed and Pest partnered with permittees on allotments north of Cody, Wyoming, in Park County. The partners worked together to develop on-the-ground treatments to improve upland and riparian habitats, develop grazing strategies that rotate or eliminate hot and growing season use, establish a “walk-in” hunting program, conduct an intensive noxious weed control effort, and initiate a grass bank on the TNC managed property.

**Considerations:** A mission statement should be developed to clarify and focus the efforts of groups within a collaborative effort, and correct their course if necessary.

#### IV. Education/Interpretation Tools

##### (A) **Tool: Directed Public Participation and Involvement**

**General Application:** Inclusion of the public or public entities in the development of BLM educational and interpretive programs and projects.

**Range of Applications:**

- Red Rock National Conservation Area – Development of Wayside displays along scenic drive using public input
- California National Historic Trails Interpretive Center – Development of Interpretive Center and placement of Wayside exhibits along key highways leading to Elko, Nevada, using citizen participation and involvement
- Quarterly Congressional Briefings – BLM briefings of Arizona delegation staffers on current BLM projects and potentially controversial issues.

**Considerations:** None.

##### (B) **Tool: Technology, Information and Data Sharing**

**General Application:** Development and dissemination of technologies for expanding access to information and data for public awareness and more effective planning and management of Federal lands.

***Range of Applications:***

- Community Viz – In cooperation with the Orton Foundation and the National Association of Counties, BLM is proposing to bring the Community Viz 3-dimensional computer model to rural communities to assist them with integrated planning processes, particularly balancing growth with maintenance of open space; BLM Las Cruces Field Office proposes to use Community Viz as it works with community and local government partners in upcoming RMP revision.
- Sonoran Institute and BLM Economic Profile System – Joint development of the Economic Profile System by the Sonoran Institute and BLM to produce detailed socio-economic reports on every county in the West to facilitate BLM planning.
- Data Sharing – Proposed NACO/BLM joint project to share data bases at county and federal level to ensure best available data is used.
- Cadastral Survey and GIS Data Exchange – Collaborative effort between BLM and communities to establish, standardize and improve the ownership and land title information used by all government organizations as well as private industry in land management decision-making.

***Considerations:*** None.

**(C) *Tool: 4C's Agency and Public Training, Skills Development and Capacity Building***

***General Application:*** Provide training to BLM managers and staff in community-based partnerships for the purpose of enhancing stewardship, building successful partnerships, developing funding sources, and using volunteers effectively; also provide training for other agency and public partners to foster knowledgeable participation in bureau planning and program implementation.

***Range of Applications:***

- BLM National Training Center Partnership Series (NTCPS)
  - Community-Based Volunteering
  - Learning Community
  - Community-Based Partnerships and Ecosystems
  - Alternative Funding
- Agency and Public Cross Training
  - Tonopah, NV: BLM, FS and County road crews trained to same standards, allowing coordination of road maintenance efforts. Under a cooperative agreement each party could do maintenance on other parties' roads.

***Considerations:*** Has potential to play key role in overall development and implementation of citizen-based and community-based 4 C's tools and projects. NTCPS training should be extended to BLM staff (now available only to BLM managers and community leaders).

## V. Advisory Tools

### (A) **Tool: Special Advisory Committees (FACA-Authorized)**

**General Applications:** Special committees established to address targeted Federal lands and Federal land issues.

**Range of Applications:**

- Paiute and Great Western Trail System – Paiute ATV Trail Committee was created in 1989 by federal, state, local and private partners to deal with issues and resolutions for the management of the trail system.

**Considerations:** Additional examples should be added to this tool category.

### (B) **Tool: Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) and RAC Sub-Groups**

**General Applications:** Provide advice and consultation to BLM on Federal land issues and land planning

**Range of Applications:**

- Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area – Creation of RAC Sub-Group team to participate in NCA collaborative planning effort
- Pilot Project Administration – Proposed selection, guidance/advisory and oversight role for RACs in the administration of local 4 C's pilot projects

**Considerations:** Additional examples should be added to this tool category. Moreover, RACs and RAC subgroups have not been fully utilized or developed for the purpose of advancing 4 C's goals on Federal lands.

### (C) **Tool: Public Meetings for Consultation on Issues and Actions**

**General Applications:** Use of public meetings by BLM to address issues of great import to local communities and to draw upon citizen input for advice on issues and support for management actions.

**Range of Applications:**

- Burning Man Special Recreation Permit – BLM consulted with communities and Indian Tribes adjacent to Burning Man event, as well as numerous agencies and organizations, and private companies servicing the event, to identify special conditions for the event's recreation permit (with objective of addressing and mitigating local issues and concerns).
- Red Rock National Conservation Area – Development of Wayside displays along scenic drive using public input.
- California National Historic Trails Interpretive Center – Development of Interpretive Center and placement of Wayside exhibits along key highways leading to Elko, Nevada, using citizen participation and involvement.

**Considerations:** None.

(D) **Tool: Non-FACA Information Gathering**

**General Application:** Use of informal discussions with community and interest group leaders to gain their perspective on agency plans.

**Range of Applications** (examples needed):

- New Mexico Counties – Counties in New Mexico are considering establishment of local grazing advisory boards on the model of the Taylor Grazing Act, and meeting informally with BLM on matters related to livestock grazing.

**Considerations:** GSA guidelines and regulations as of July 2001 expand opportunities for agencies to work with public entities outside of the FACA framework and requirements.

## VI. Inter-Agency Coordination and Cooperation Tools

(A) **Tool: Service First**

**General Application:** A legislated collaborative partnership between BLM and FS; goal to share ideas, skills, resources, and to deliver programs and services more cost effectively and in a way that makes sense to BLM and FS customers

**Range of Applications:**

- Canon City, CO – BLM and FS employees share workloads and responsibilities from common office.
- Idaho – State and Federal agencies honor single pass for frequent wildland visitors.
- Central Oregon – Collaborative BLM/FS projects.
- Idaho – Joint EIS by BLM/FS for proposed plan amendments on management of Canada Lynx habitat within northern Rocky Mountain area.
- Hospitality Industry Partnership – BLM and FS partner under Service First to provide Hospitality Industry a consistent and seamless product, and to provide the same to the public utilizing the National Landscape Conservation System..

**Considerations:** Priority program within both DOI and DOA with grant funding available to encourage participation.

(B) **Tool: Consolidation of Bureau Functions**

**General Application:** More effective, consistent and coordinated delivery of government services to agency customers.

**Range of Applications** (more examples needed):

- Farmington FIMO – Consolidation of mineral activities of BIA, BLM and MMS to provide one-stop shopping for Indian mineral owners.

**Considerations:** None.

(C) **Tool: Inter-Agency and Multi-Agency Coordination and Cooperation**

**General Application:** Agreements and partnerships between multiple agencies to foster more effective management of Federal lands.

**Range of Applications:**

- Moab Information Center – Provides one-stop shopping for visitors to BLM, FS and NPS lands in the Moab area.
- Seeds of Success- Government to government cooperative agreement between BLM and the Royal Botanic Gardens in Kew, England, to collect, study, and conserve seeds of American native plants located on BLM lands and to include those seeds in the Kew Millennium Seed Bank in England.
- Nevada Abandoned Mine Lands Hazard Remediation – BLM works with Nevada Division of Minerals under a formal agreement for abandoned mine remediation projects; Nevada BLM has produced programmatic EA to expedite NEPA process; BLM has used multi-agency coordination to prioritize remediation sites.
- Nevada Governor's Sage-Grouse Conservation Team – Inter-agency Federal and State collaborative effort led by Governor of Nevada to formulate sage grouse local conservation plans, emphasizing local involvement and decision-making.
- Amargosa Toad Habitat Conservation Plan – Multi-agency design and designation of Habitat Conservation Plan for the Amargosa Toad, using broad public participation and state-of-art science.
- Barry Goldwater Executive Council – Arizona BLM brought together managing agencies with jurisdiction within the Barry M. Goldwater Bombing Range and formed the Barry Goldwater Executive Council to coordinate bombing range issues and to provide the public with a consistent, single management presence to address their concerns.
- Arizona Department of Game and Fish Planning Coordination – BLM and Arizona Game and Fish agreed to assign Game and Fish employee to BLM state headquarters to work on Monument planning efforts as they pertain to wildlife management.
- Taos County Emergency Response Center – BLM Taos Field Office coordinated with local government and agencies in Taos County to develop a centralized emergency response center to provide more effective emergency communications in the Taos area.
- Timbisha Tribal Homeland – Work group made-up of NPS, BIA, BLM and Tribal representatives was established to identify, inspect, evaluate and select properties recommended for conveyance to the Timbisha Tribe, per the mandate of the California Desert Protection Act; the cooperative effort resulted in legislation conveying the properties to the Tribe.

**Considerations:** None.

(D) **Tool: Inter-Agency Sponsorship of Autonomous Private Non-Profit Foundations and Other Public Service Organizations**

**General Application:** Creation of non-profit organizations to provide conservation and land management services that cannot be provided by the federal agencies sponsoring those organizations.

**Range of Applications:**

- Outside Las Vegas Foundation – Private non-profit foundation established by BLM, FS, FWS and NPS to provide long-term protection and appropriate use of public lands surrounding Las Vegas, to promote environmental education for visitors and community, build community capacity for stewardship, enhance quality of public lands, and foster capacity and agency collaboration; complimented by *Southern Nevada Public Land Act* authorizing retention and use of proceeds from sale of BLM lands within Nevada for the above purposes.
- Leave No Trace – BLM-FS sponsored non-profit organization with agency staff on Board of Directors as “advisors;” provides stewardship education and promotes conservation ethics for recreational land users, specifically OHV enthusiasts; administered through MOUs and assistance agreements.
- Tread Lightly! – BLM, FS, NPS, BOR and Corps of Engineers sponsored non-profit organization with agency staff on Board of Directors as “advisors;” establishes and encourages conservation standards and ethics for OHV industry in advertising vehicles and equipment; administered through MOU with Tread Lightly!.
- Paiute and Great Western Trail System – The Paiute and Great Western Trail System is a partnership between BLM, FS, Utah State Parks, county and city governments, private land owners, business and user groups; Paiute ATV Trail Committee was created in 1989 to deal with issues and resolutions for the management of the trail system.
- Susanville Depot and the Bizz Johnson Trail – BLM facilitated formation of the non-profit Lassen Land and Trails Trust for (1) transfer of ownership of Susanville Depot and Visitor Center for future management and stewardship and (2) cooperative management of the Bizz Johnson Trail.

**Considerations:** None.

## VII. Alternative Funding Tools

(A) **Tool: Challenge Cost-Share**

**General Application:** Existing funding source that can be used as leveraging tool to encourage collaboration and entrepreneurial efforts.

(B) **Tool: Land and Water Conservation Fund**

**General Application:** Existing funding source that can be used as leveraging tool to encourage collaboration and entrepreneurial efforts.

(C) **Tool: Title II/III Funding (PILT)**

**General Application:** Existing funding source that can be used as leveraging tool to encourage collaboration and entrepreneurial efforts.

(D) **Tool: Fee Demonstration Program**

**General Application:** Existing funding source that can be used as leveraging tool to encourage collaboration and entrepreneurial efforts.

(E) **Tool: ISTE/T-21 Funding**

**General Application:** Existing funding source that can be used as leveraging tool to encourage collaboration and entrepreneurial efforts.

**APPENDIX I****MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Kathleen Clarke, Dir. - BLM (w/o encl.)  
Con Lass (w/o encl.)  
Elena Daly  
Tom Fulton (w/o encl.)

**cc:** Karl Hess (w/o encl.)  
Chris Kearney (w/o encl.)

**FROM:** Rebecca Watson, AS/LM

**DATE:** June 10, 2002

---

I met with Lynn Scarlett, Karl Hess and Chris Kearney today concerning 4 C's pilot projects. I shared with them BLM's working group paper, "Implementation of the 4 C's Using Collaborative Models." In addition, I provided a copy of the attached paper from Matt McKinney, "Options to Create Pilot Projects on Federal Lands Governance," notes of the Eastern Regionalism (another way to say local collaboration) Conference and a letter and materials from Professor Susskind who teaches on collaboration. In addition, I have also attached for your use a memo from Lynn on "Seminars on Integrating Scientific Information Effectively into Collaborative Processes" and a piece on a Moffat County pilot project.

The next step from the meeting is that Karl Hess will work with Elena Daly to address in a paper three information needs that Lynn and I believe can help guide our consideration of the BLM 4 C's pilot project concept.

- (A) Identify and document existing 4 C's projects with particular attention to the means or tools used to implement these projects.
- (B) Explore future pilot projects that could be developed. Particularly, consider some of the ideas suggested in Matt McKinney's paper.
- (C) Identify barriers to the growth and development of 4 C's projects and how BLM is addressing the barriers.

Karl and Elena would take the laboring oar in pulling this information together in a consolidated package. From this, we would then be in better shape to address what we need: training, policy guidance, leadership, legislation, rulemaking, public affairs support, etc. to highlight 4 C's in action and to address barriers to success.

I think this is a good next step that can be integrated into what I hope will be the on-going work of the BLM's 4 C's working group. As I mentioned earlier, I think we need to have a BLM 4 C's working group that has continuity over the next two years. The working group, and particularly the chair of that group, would be tasked to coordinate with PMB staff, ASLM and BLM state and field offices on 4 C's policy/project development so that we can make BLM's 4 C's efforts a centerpiece for the Secretary.

## APPENDIX II

### Options to Create Pilot Projects on Federal Lands Governance

By Matthew McKinney, Ph.D.  
Executive Director, Western Consensus Council  
Draft of June 4, 2002

This options paper is a collection of the many proposals for pilot projects and experimental approaches to federal lands management and governance – organized around the key elements of any legislative or administrative framework to authorize such projects. *Please feel free to offer additional options and/or elements of any proposed framework* Thanks to everyone who has reviewed and contributed to this options paper.

#### Principles for the Suggested Framework

- a. The authorizing framework should establish a national competition for pilot projects to foster a spirit of entrepreneurialism, diversity, and excellence.
- b. Pilot projects should be governed by a fundamental principle of transparency – that is, the decisions and actions of pilot projects should be open and transparent.
- c. Pilot projects should be monitored and evaluated by a National Oversight Committee on Pilot Projects that may include members of Congress, the Administration, and organizations with an interest in federal lands management. The operating principle here is to model an inclusive, informed, deliberative (that is, collaborative) process.
- d. Pilot projects should be experimental in nature: this is not a proposal to change the entire system of federal lands management.
- e. Pilot projects should be encouraged across a range of issues, administrative jurisdictions, and geographic scales.

#### Elements of the Suggested Framework

##### Options to Develop Pilot Projects

- a. Anyone may submit a proposal through an open, competitive process.
- b. Inclusive groups that represent all stakeholders, including public officials and agencies, must develop proposals.
- c. Public officials and agencies, in consultation with diverse stakeholders, should develop proposals.

##### Options to Select Pilot Projects

- a. The National Oversight Committee on Pilot Projects mentioned above.
- b. A national advisory council on pilot projects that reviews proposals and makes recommendations to the National Oversight Committee on Pilot Projects for final selection.
- c. The Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, in consultation with western Governors

(and legislatures).

#### Options on Who Participates

- a. Representation must be inclusive ... that is, participants must reflect the full range of interests and viewpoints on a given project.
- b. The group must represent local, state, regional, and national interests.
- c. A certain percent of participants must live in and represent the local area (existing examples include Valles Caldera and Presidio).

#### Options on Who Selects or Appoints Participants

- a. Participants are determined from the ground-up, consistent with c (i). The full group ratifies the final composition of any group.
- b. Participants are determined from the ground-up, consistent with c (i). The national advisory council on pilot projects ratifies the final composition of any group.
- c. The Governor and Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior jointly appoint representatives according to some formula to ensure balanced representation (existing examples include BLM and US Forest Service Resource Advisory Councils).

#### Options on the Authority of the Participants

- a. Govern - that is, to make and enforce decisions.
- b. Qualified Governance # 1 - that is, to make broad decisions about the desired ends or outcomes of a pilot project, and to then allow federal land managers and others develop and implement the appropriate means or strategies to achieve those ends.
- c. Qualified Governance #2- to make and enforce decisions ... the agencies responsible for implementing the decisions may appeal to the "oversight committee" and explain why a particular cannot or should not be implemented.
- d. Advisory - the participants advise the responsible agencies on outcomes (ends) and strategies (means), but the agency officials have final decision-making authority.

#### Options on Defining the Scope and Purpose of Pilot Projects

- a. NOTE - this element may duplicate 4(a), so let's think about combining the two.
- b. The overall scope and purpose of pilot projects is to (these may become criteria for selecting pilot projects):
  1. Promote sustainable communities.
  2. Promote sustainable landscapes.
  3. Utilize inclusive, informed, deliberative processes for decision-making.
  4. Provide fair, effective, and efficient means to resolve disputes or appeals to decisions that are made under pilot projects.
- c. The people and organizations submitting proposals should determine the scope and purpose of pilot projects.
- d. Proposals should include a clearly articulated "causal theory," that is, a clear hypothesis and linkage between what they are trying to achieve (the ends or outcomes) and how they propose to achieve their desired results (the means or strategies or activities).

#### Options on Sideboards Within Which Pilot Projects Must Operate

- a. NOTE - this element may overlap with the discussion on "Principles," item 3 above... so let's think about combining the two.
- b. Pilot projects must comply with all existing laws and policies.

- c. Pilot projects must comply with all existing laws, but are exempt from administrative rules, regulations, and policies.
- d. Same as c, but participants may request an exemption from an existing law ... and the National Oversight Committee on Pilot Projects may grant permission.

#### Options on Who Can Appeal Decisions Made By Pilot Projects

- a. Anyone.
- b. Only people who have formally participated in the decision-making process.

#### Options on How to Resolve Appeals

- a. Use a mandatory dispute resolution system that moves from low-cost dispute resolution procedures to high-cost procedures:
  1. Negotiation among appellants and pilot project participants.
  2. Mediation among appellants and pilot project participants.
  3. Binding or non-binding arbitration.
  4. Judicial resolution in a court-of-law.
- b. Eliminate administrative appeals; and, presumably, go straight to court.
- c. Appeal to the National Oversight Committee on Pilot Projects.
- d. Appeal to either the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Interior.

#### Options to Enforce, Monitor, and Evaluate Pilot Projects

- a. Applicants should clarify in writing a set of performance-based standards or measurements - in terms of process and outcomes. If the agreed-upon standards are not being met, someone needs to "pull the plug."
- b. Project participants should submit annual reports to the National Oversight Committee on Pilot Projects ... based on the "causal theory" of the pilot project.
- c. Annual or biennial meeting of pilot project participants to exchange ideas, document lessons learned, and identify what works, what doesn't, and why.
- d. Evaluation of pilot projects by the General Accounting Office after 3-5 years.
- e. Evaluation of pilot projects by independent observers after 3-5 years.

#### **References**

**American Heritage Rivers Initiative.** Online at <http://www.epa.gov/rivers/eo13061.html1>.

**Forest Options Group (FOG) Second Century Report (5 projects):** Entrepreneurial Budgeting, Collaborative Governance, Collaborative Planning, Forests Trusts, Rate Board. Online at <http://www.to.org/2c.html>.

**Foundation for Research on Economics and the Environment (FREE),** Missouri River Project (3 projects): Thorson, Fairfax and O'Toole, Fischer. Online at <http://www.free-eco.org/rfp/index.html>.

**Idaho Federal Lands Task Force Working Group Report,** Federal Land Pilot Projects in Idaho (5 projects): Central Idaho Ecosystem Trust, Clearwater Basin Stewardship Collaborative, Priest Lake Basin Cooperative, St. Joe Stewardship Project, Twin Falls/Cassia Resource Enhancement Trust. Online at <http://www2.state.id.us/lands/LandBoard/fltf.html>.

**Moffat County Northwest Colorado Working Landscape Trust.** Online at

[http://www.co.moffat.co.us/Natural Resources/Trust\\_final.pdf](http://www.co.moffat.co.us/Natural%20Resources/Trust_final.pdf).

**Presidio Trust Act.** Online at [http://www.presidiotrust.gov/archive/archive\\_trust\\_act.asp](http://www.presidiotrust.gov/archive/archive_trust_act.asp).

**Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000.** Online at <http://thomas.loc.gov>.

**Valles Caldera National Preservation Act.** Online at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/sfe/valles/Library/prevAct.html>.

### APPENDIX III

#### Table of 4 C's Projects, Activities and Proposals

The projects, activities and proposals referenced for the preliminary classification of 4 C's tools are listed below in alphabetical order with state of implementation, bureau contact name, and telephone number noted, respectively.

Project	State	Contact	Telephone Number
Abandoned Mine Cleanup: Upper Animas	CO	Steven Cohen	202-785-6589
Agency and Public Cross Training	WO	Ron Huntsinger	505-751-4700
Amargosa Toad Habitat Conservation Plan	NV	Jerry Smith	775-635-4000
America's Backyard	WO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Anasazi Heritage Center	CO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Applegate Partnership	OR	Ron Huntsinger	505-751-4700
Arizona Dept Game and Fish Planning Coord.	AZ	Mike Taylor	602-417-9231
Barry Goldwater Executive Council	AZ	Mike Taylor	602-417-9231
Blackfoot Challenge	MT	(BLM WO – Implementation of the 4 C's)	
Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon ... NCA	NV	Jamie Thompson	775-623-1541
Black Rock Desert Volunteers	NV	Terry Reed	775-623-1500
BLM Natl Training Cntr Partnership Series	WO	Steven Cohen	202-785-6589
Bloody Shins Partnership Information	NV	Terry Reed	775-623-1500
Bradshaw/Agua Fria National Monument RMP	AZ	Mike Taylor	602-417-9231
Burning Man Special Recreation Permit	NV	Terry Reed	775-623-1500
California National Historic Trails Interp Cntr	NV	Helen Hankins	775-753-0201
Campbell Creek Science Center	AK	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Canyon City, CO Service First	CO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Cascade Streamwatch Project	OR	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Central Oregon Service First	OR	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Colorado Plateau Mountain Bike Trail System	CO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Community Viz	WO	Cynthia Moses-Nedd	202-452-5114
Coral Pink Sand Dunes	UT	Steven Cohen	202-785-6589
Data Sharing	WO	Cynthia Moses-Nedd	202-452-5114
Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project	NV	Gene Kolkman	(Ely Field FO)
Elko Field Office	NV	Helen Hankins	775-753-0201
Farmington FIMO	NM	Rich Whitley	505-438-7501
Friends of Yaquina Lighthouses	OR	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Galisteo Basin Proposal	NM	Ron Huntsinger	505-751-4700
Heart Mountain Partnerships	WY	Alan Kesterke	(Wyoming SO)
Hospitality Industry Partnership	WO	Cynthia Moses-Nedd	202-452-5114
Humboldt County Weed Management CA	NV	Terry Reed	775-623-1500
Hutton Junior Fisheries Biology Program	WO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Idaho Service First – Lynx Plan Amendment	ID	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Idaho Service First – Single Pass	ID	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Interim Forest Plan, Nevada County, CA	CA	Steven Cohen	202-785-6589
Jawbone Station/Friends of Jawbone	CA	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument	NM	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Knowlton Travel Plan, Eastern Montana	MT	Steven Cohen	202-785-6589
Las Cienegas National Conservation Area	AZ	Steve Cohen	202-785-6589
Leave No Trace	WO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Lemhi Model Watershed Project	ID	(BLM WO – Implementation of the 4 C's)	
Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration	WO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040

<u>Project</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Telephone Number</u>
Little Sahara and Yuba Reservoir	UT	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Lovelock Cave and Lovelock Cave Back Country	NV	Terry Reed	775-623-1500
Moab Information Center Interagency CA	UT	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Moab Information Center	UT	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Muddy Creek Coord. Resource Management Project	WY	Alan Kesterke	(Wyoming SO)
National Public Lands Day	WO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Nevada Abandoned Mine Lands Hazard Remed.	NV	Bob Abbey	775-861-6590
Nevada BLM Partnership with NV Developer	NV	John Singlaub	(Carson City FO)
Nevada Gov. Sage-Grouse Conservation Team	NV	Terry Reed	775-623-1500
New Mexico Counties	NM	Bob Alexanfder	505-438-7428
New Mexico State BLM Office	NM	Rich Whitley	505-438-7501
Northeastern Nevada Stewardship Group, Inc.	NV	Helen Hankins	775-753-0201
Outside Las Vegas Foundation	NV	Bob Abbey	775-861-6590
Paiute and Great Western Trail System	UT	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Partners for Grassland Stewardship	MT	(BLM WO – Implementation of the 4 C's)	
Pine Nut Mountains RMP Plan Amendment	NV	Elayn Briggs	775-885-6170
Permittee Stewardship Contracts	WO	Directors Office	202-208-3801
Pompeys Pillar Historical Association	MT	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Pompeys Pillar National Monument	MT	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Public Lands Information Center	AZ	Mike Taylor	602-417-9231
Quarterly Congressional Briefings	AZ	Mike Taylor	602-417-9231
Red Hill Council Action Alternative	CO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Red Hill Memorandum of Understanding	CO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Red Rock National Conservation Area	NV	Mark T. Morse	702-515-5093
Salmon Field Office Community-Based Planning	ID	Ron Huntsinger	505-751-4700
Sand Flats Recreation Area	UT	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Scappoose Bay Watershed Habitat Improvement	OR	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Seeds of Success	WO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Small Business Plan Preparation	WO	Cynthia Moses-Nedd	202-452-5114
Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan	AZ	Steven Cohen	202-785-6589
Sonoran Institute and BLM Econ Profile System	WO	Steven Cohen	202-785-6589
Susanville Depot and the Bizz Johnson Trail	CA	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Taos County Emergency Response Center	NM	Ron Huntsinger	505-751-4700
Timbisha Tribal Homeland	CA	Ron Huntsinger	505-751-4700
Tread Lightly!	WO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Upper Klamath Basin Working Group	OR	Steven Cohen	202-785-6589
Wildfire Support Group, Winnemucca Field Office	NV	Terry Reed	775-623-1500
Wonderful Outdoor World	WO	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040
Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area	OR	Bob Ratcliffe	202-452-5040

## VIII. ATTACHMENT TWO

### DRAFT 3-YEAR WORK PLAN FOR 4 C's COORDINATOR

Work Plan Key:

- Task will be initiated within the next 6 months – High priority (H)
- Task will be initiated between the next 6 months to 1 year – Medium priority (M)
- Task will be initiated in 1 year or later – Low priority (L)

	Action Statement	Tool	Priority	Responsibility/ Funding	Initiate	Completed	Comments
1	Develop Action Plan for implementation of 4 C's Initiative		H	4 C's Detailee (Rich Whitley)	2/03	6/03	
2	Interview key departmental decision makers and community leaders, counties officials, interest groups, tribes, other government organizations, and Non-Government Organizations. Interviews will provide an outline for the direction community stewardship should take for BLM.	Interviews	H	4 C's Detailee (Rich Whitley)	1/03	Ongoing	This will continue as part of the evaluation process to help determine if we are meeting our objectives.
3	Assess current activities	IM	H	Assistant Sec. Director	10/02	complete	See 4C's Report, Partnership Report and Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution Report
4	Brief the ELT and get support for the Work Plan	Briefing	H	Coordinator	8/03		
5	Develop Communications Strategy.	IM	H	Coordinator and AD Communications	7/03		Create consistent national outreach presentation on community stewardship, partnership and ADR. Strategy needs to be tied to training, business, and strategic plans.
6	Establish 3 task forces to develop recommendations for removing procurement, budget, and human resource, barriers and review the need for additional authorities.	IM	H	Director	6/03		Closely coordinate with Dept.
7	Assemble a Community Stewardship Task Force		H	Director	5/03	Complete	Provides 4-6 weeks/yr support

	(formerly 4C's Task Force)						of Initiative on Two- year rotating terms.
8	Collaborate with Partnership Task Force, ADR Task Force, Dept. MIT and other to ensure connection of BLM efforts with other ongoing initiatives.	Regular meeting with other groups	H	Coordinator	Ongoing	Ongoing	
9	Identify new start-ups for community stewardship (Moffat Co.)		H	Director	7/03		Task Force Recommendation. Task Force will establish criteria.
10	The Director Approve the Community Stewardship Work Plan	Briefing	H	Coordinator	6/03		
11	Send Instruction to the field on work plan.	IM	H	Director	6/03		
12	Develop a set of performance indicators and measures that will enable BLM to track and report community stewardship efforts.	DOI/BLM Strategic Plan	H	Coordinator and Budget Team. Kit Muller	6/03	9/03	
13	Develop a set of output measures that will enable BLM to plan and tracks costs, report work accomplishments, and develop unit costs.	Program Elements and other strategies	H	Coordinator and Budget Team	6/03	9/03	
14	Explore strategies for incorporating BLM's community stewardship strategy into the budget execution process – Team Analysis	FY 2004 PTA	H	WO 200, 300, 400,800 and Community Stewardship and Partnership Task Force	04/03	8/03	Budget related <i>Met with Steve Tryon (WO Budget)</i>
15	Explore strategies for incorporating BLM's community stewardship strategy into the budget development process – Team Analysis	FY 2005 President's Budget request	H	WO 200, 300, 400,800 and Partnership Task Force (Helene–detail)	05/03		Budget related
16	Review and revise as appropriate, policy for the CCI/CCS program to be supportive community stewardship – Team Analysis	Policy/IM	H	WO 200, 300, 400,800 and Partnership Task Force (Helene–detail)	06/03		Budget related
17	Develop policy and guidelines for managing reimbursable funds in association with community stewardship and partnerships.	IM and post on Web	H	NBC and WO800 (Helene–detail)	07/03		Budget related Procurement related
18	Identify and track funding or budget issues as they are developed under goal 2 and 3 and incorporate them into the budget section of the work plan.		M	Partnership Task Force	On-going		Budget related
19	Evaluate training needs, recruitment strategies,	Policy/IM	H	Coordinator, Human Resources	6/03		

	EPPR,s, PD's, Vacancy Announcements and incentives.			Team			
20	Evaluate need for Community Outreach/Partnership Coordinator positions.	Policy/IM	M	Coordinator, Community Stewardship Task Group and Partnership Task Group	10/03		If approved this will need to be included in Work Force Planning.
21	Explore ways of furthering interagency coordination.			Coordinator			
22	Develop comprehensive, annotated list of authorities under which BLM works with partners	White Paper	H	Coordinator, Authorities Team,AD 400, 600, 250	7/03		
23	Develop a paper on dos/don'ts related to FACA	White Paper	H	Coordinator	09/03		Assistant Sec office is working on this.
24	Develop a template/tools/ model kit for the field to follow when establishing community stewardship, partnership, and ADR efforts	Tool Kit/template Web-based	M	Coordinator, Partnership and ADR Task Forces	12/03		Based on data call. Review FS PRC and revise to fit NLCS if necessary
25	Establish BLM intranet site to disseminate community stewardship, partnership, and ADR tools to field.	Intranet Lotus Notes Database	M	Coordinator, Community Stewardship and Partnership Task Forces	10/03		
26	Post list of community stewardship, placed-based partnerships and ADR BLM contacts for each.	List on Web	H	Coordinator, Community Stewardship, Partnership and ADR Task Forces	06/03		
27	Share success stories.	Post on Web	M	Partnerships Task Force	12/03		Begin with USFS recent data call (2/5)
28	Post toolbox on Web that includes, but is not limited to: appropriate administrative and procurement tools to use in developing and sustaining ,community stewardship and partnerships; information on setting up, ethics rules for working with partners; identification of options for attracting and recognizing partners; all of the various training opportunities, and sample agreements/templates to aid the field in developing their own site specific agreements.	Intranet Internet	H M	Staff Lead and Partnership Task Force with input from numerous other sources	04/03		Partner with USFS PRC – add/revise for a seamless PRC
29	Work with communities to identify capacity building needs		H	Coordinator, Community Stewardship Task Force	9/03		
30	Develop Communications Strategy		H	Coordinator and AD Communications	7/03	8/03	

31	Develop list BLM and partners who have had success in community stewardship who are willing to coach and mentor others.		H	Coordinator will maintain list.	2/03	5/03	This list will be continually updated as more people become engaged in community stewardship.

### In 3-5 years:

- ❖ Bureau executives, managers and employees, understand and support Community Stewardship/Outcome Based Performance
- ❖ Changes in regulations, policies and procedures (planning, procurement, human resources, budget) are in place to facilitate implementation.
- ❖ Internal training and skills development tools are in place to facilitate implementation
- ❖ Communities of place and interest understand and support implementation.
- ❖ Bureau executives, managers, employees, understand their new roles (facilitate, educate, partner)
- ❖ Community needs have been identified to address capacity building.

## ATTACHMENT THREE

### FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR 4 C's PROJECT SELECTION AND OPERATION

During its deliberations in preparation of the 4 C's Report to the Assistant Secretary of Land & Minerals Management, the 4 C's Working Group discussed a range of factors relating to 4 C's project selection and operation. These factors are presented here as a resource for the BLM as it moves forward in the implementation of the 4 C's Initiative. They are not intended to be prescriptive criteria. Rather, they are offered as a toolbox of considerations that may be useful in determining how bureau resources are best expended to attain the mission of the 4 C's Initiative.

As previously indicated, the purpose of the 4 C's Initiative is to institutionalize the Secretary's 4 C's and the new environmentalism in the daily business of the BLM. To that end, the initiative is about promoting and fostering innovation and implementation of 4 C's principles and activities at all agency levels. The Initiative does not seek to limit creativity and inventiveness among BLM managers or citizens by filtering and prioritizing what projects can or cannot proceed. The initiative has as its singular focus facilitating citizen conservation and making full citizen stewardship of public lands a reality – not testing the worthiness of one or the other, or assessing their desirability through controlled experimentation and selected pilot trials. The initiative exists solely to enhance current 4 C's practices through systematic and systemic institutional support and to discover and share more effective and better ways to make shared stewardship and place-based public participation the principle driving forces in public land planning and management. It is about affecting and attaining each of these ends through projects and activities defined as widely as possible and implemented as broadly as practical. These projects and activities, built on working partnerships with the agency, will map the future course of the 4 C's on public lands.

Ideally, all 4 C's efforts should be supported to some degree by the initiative. In part they will be, through creation of universally accessible data and information networks, the assemblage and dissemination of support and guidance materials to partners, including field office staff, removal of barriers to 4 C's activities and projects, training and education, and integration of 4 C's skills, knowledge and abilities into the core requirements for BLM staff. Despite the initiative's open-ended and ecumenical approach to 4 C's innovation and development, its ability to address all 4 C's efforts equally and adequately is constrained by available resources. It is therefore necessary to explore the range of factors that can help BLM identify projects most appropriate to the Initiative and determine the best allocation of limited resources.

Operationally, the initiative is designed to support programmatic activities and on-the-ground projects that incorporate 4 C's approaches to capacity development, public land planning and plan implementation. Project support can take many forms, but in general it entails providing and opening access for partners – both BLM and non-BLM – to information, assistance and guidance relevant to project and activity design, development, implementation and funding acquisition. To the extent targeted funds are available, the initiative can offer direction and recommendation for the dispersal of those funds to 4 C's projects and activities, consistent with the initiative's mission, goal and objectives, its framing or structural elements, and the various factors regarding project/activity selection and operation within the 4 C's Initiative.

Selection factors set forth the attributes or conditions that determine which projects and activities are most consistent with the purposes of the initiative and which projects and activities should receive initiative support, including what form of support and in what quantities. Selection factors provide the means to identify and then prioritize or rank projects and activities for subsequent support within the 4 C's Initiative. They help focus resources on those projects and activities that are most consistent with the mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative and which have the highest probability of contributing significantly to advancing the 4 C's in general and community stewardship in particular within the bureau and on public lands.

Operation criteria set forth the guidelines for project administration – for the implementation and operation of projects in a manner that is consistent with the 4 C's and the mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative.

It should be noted that projects not selected for focused support within the 4 C's Initiative are not precluded from continuing to seek innovative and creative ways to solve land management issues. Indeed, it is important that these efforts continue to add to the base of knowledge for community stewardship that BLM wishes to enlarge.

In summary, factors are necessary to: (1) identify 4 C's projects and activities most consistent with and contributory toward the purpose of full community stewardship of public lands; (2) rank the 4 C's projects and activities that fall within that 4 C's frontier of innovation; (3) prioritize 4 C's projects and activities for types and levels of support; and (4) provide administrative guidelines for implementation and operation of projects consistent with the 4 C's and the mission, goal and objectives of the 4 C's Initiative. Below are the principal factors that meet these requirements. Project selection factors are sub-categorized by mission, process, implementation and outcomes. Project operation factors are not sub-categorized.

### **Project Selection Factors – Factors for standards and ranking to identify and prioritize projects for support and allocation of resources within the 4 C's Initiative.**

*(1) Mission Factor – Projects proposed for inclusion and support within the 4 C's Initiative should include or engage actions and activities consistent with the mission, goal and objectives of the initiative and the leading purpose of advancing full community stewardship of public lands; specifically:*

- Qualifying projects should be based on shared stewardship partnerships between BLM, citizens and communities that provide for broad and substantive public participation in the planning, management, conservation, restoration and sustainable use of public lands, consistent with federal statutes and regulations;
- Qualifying projects should embrace or promote integrated, landscape-level approaches to public land management that are consistent with conservation, sustainable land use, and healthy communities;
- Qualifying projects should advance, enable or engage innovations in natural resource management and land governance, including the use of one or more 4 C's tools or the contribution of new tools to the 4 C's inventory;

- Qualifying projects should help institutionalize within BLM and its staff a commitment to the values, processes and outcomes of citizen conservation and community stewardship as consistent with and necessary to the agency's mission; and
- Qualifying projects should be outcome-based in their implementation with clear and quantifiable performance elements established to measure and evaluate their success.

*(2) Process Factor – Projects otherwise qualifying for support within the 4 C's Initiative must exhibit the following process characteristics:*

- Qualifying projects can originate from the initiative of BLM, citizen groups, Resource Advisory Councils (RACS) or any combination of the three; projects eligible for initiative support must, however, be (1) the shared product of a working partnership of equals between federal and public members; (2) place-based unless programmatic; and (3) locally driven by partnered BLM field staff, citizens and communities of place and interest.
- Qualifying projects must (1) include or, at a minimum, be open to the relevant universe of interested parties; (2) demonstrate substantial community support; (3) engage a process of project planning and NEPA compliance that is fully collaborative at the outset; and (4) establish, where appropriate to the NEPA process and project in question, the community- or consensus-based plan – *the 4 C's partnership proposal* – as the preferred alternative.
- Qualifying projects must either be new or, if in progress, not substantially close to completion. In either case, qualifying projects must demonstrate:
  - Consensus among partners on project outcomes
  - Monitoring protocols keyed to indicators or benchmarks
  - Transparency in project operations
  - Clear and visible identification of partners and their memberships
  - Clear and visible assignment of roles and responsibilities among partners (including sideboards regarding agency role and power)
- Qualifying projects must demonstrate a substantive involvement of the local RAC or sub-group, including:
  - Review of and consultation on the project's content between the local RAC, or a sub-group, and the project's partnership; or
  - Initiation of the project by the local RAC, or sub-group

*(3) Implementation Factor – Projects supported by the 4 C's Initiative should share, to some measure, the following operational characteristics:*

- Scope and purpose that include:
  - Promotion of working landscapes – distinct land areas and watershed units on which public land users, landowners, citizens and communities actively engage in some combination of sustainable resource use and conservation action,

including land, water and wildlife restoration, to advance the mission of the BLM, facilitate dynamic local economies, foster vibrant communities, and contribute healthy landscapes

- Reliance on inclusive, informed, and deliberative processes for decision-making
  - Provision for fair, effective and efficient means to resolve disputes and conflicts related to project actions and activities
  - Clear statement of what a project seeks and the means and strategies to attain it
- Contribution to the diversity of the 4 C's Initiative that includes:
    - Geographic diversity – all public land states should be represented [Note: individual projects can occur in one or more states.]
    - Community diversity – both rural and urban interface communities [Note: individual projects can be rural or urban interface, or both.]
    - Stakeholder diversity – communities of interest and communities of place [Note: individual projects should include a spectrum of community diversity commensurate with the size and significance of the project.]
    - Resource issue diversity – full issue spectrum, including recreation, grazing, wildlife, minerals, and oil & gas [Note: individual projects may have a more narrow resource issue focus, the range of which is contingent on the extent and nature of the landscape covered by the project.]
  - Adoption or advancement of landscape-level approaches to resource management; specifically:
    - Planning or implementation projects should include landscape-level components or contribute to landscape-level management solutions
    - Programmatic projects should promote capacity development, education, policy innovation or tools' development appropriate to landscape-level management
  - Incorporation of monitoring and reporting; specifically:
    - Qualifying projects should identify reasonable, practicable and measurable outcomes, including more short-term benchmarks and other outcome indicators, and the monitoring protocols to be used
    - Qualifying projects should identify partners responsible for monitoring and ensure that monitoring protocols are within the technical capacity of the partners
    - Qualifying projects must prepare and issue monitoring-based reports on a regular basis that assess and evaluate benchmarks and, as appropriate, outcomes
  - Full partner understanding and acceptance of the ramifications and responsibilities of participation within the 4 C's Initiative; specifically:
    - Projects are likely to be exposed to higher levels of visibility, scrutiny, oversight and pressures for success, including targeting for protest or appeals by potential opponents
    - Projects are likely to have compensatory or offsetting benefits for BLM field offices and their partners, including:
      - Greater immunity to successful protests or appeals

- Potential funding advantages
- Higher levels of logistic support due to high visibility within Department and among supportive communities and constituencies
- Greater access to assistance that may be requisite for project success
- Opportunity to become an agent of 4 C's-directed change within the agency and among partnered communities

(4) Outcome Factor – *Projects supported within the 4 C's Initiative should contribute to the following programmatic outcomes:*

- Qualifying projects should advance or contribute to the extension of 4 C's innovation and the purpose of community stewardship of public lands.
- Qualifying projects should advance or contribute to landscape-level management.
- Qualifying projects should advance or contribute to sustaining working landscapes.
- Qualifying projects should contribute to the institutionalization of the 4 C's among BLM staff and the permanent inclusion of the 4 C's in the ways in which BLM does business.
- Qualifying projects should contribute to resolving or positively addressing significant barriers to 4 C's applications on public lands (see *Barriers and Solutions to 4 C's Projects Implementations*).
- Qualifying projects should contribute to the 4 C's Initiative by:
  - Expanding access for all citizens to public land planning and management **and**
  - Enhancing management options and administrative tools for 4 C's applications, including the setting of new standards for stewardship; and/or
  - Contributing to best management practices on BLM lands and improving or enhancing business practices within the BLM; and/or
  - Providing universal and transportable models and lessons to advance the 4 C's, showcase program success, and inform future projects and partners on what works and does not work in the application of the 4 C's.
- Qualifying projects should be rigorously examined and assessed before hand by assessing “what happens if the project is not done; what is lost and what is the cost of doing nothing?”
- Qualifying projects should not be judged on the certainty of success. Doable projects do not translate into guaranteed projects. Innovation requires risk; projects with merit justify reasonable risk. Projects should be considered not only for their affirmative contributions if they succeed, but also for the affirmative contributions they may offer, and the lessons they may teach us, in the unanticipated situations where they fail or fall short of desired outcomes.

**Project Operation Factors – Factors for establishing administrative guidelines for implementation and operation of projects supported by the 4 C's Initiative**

- Projects must be structured and administered as partnerships.
- Projects must be achievable and operationally sustainable across time; specifically:
  - Projects must be capable of implementation within existing administrative authority
  - Projects must be operationally sustainable at the field office level; this means:
    - Field offices must be able to accommodate project needs by adjusting competing workloads to minimize negative impact on other ongoing projects
    - Projects should expand and contribute to existing staff management capacity by leveraging partner participation to optimize field office time and resources and to meet field office performance goals
    - Project goal(s), objectives and activities should be consistent with reasonable federal and non-federal funding expectations in the near- and long-terms
    - Projects should be self-sustaining to the extent possible; they should rely on local partner support and local funding sources to best ensure sustainability over time
- Projects must have strong information and transparency components; specifically:
  - Mechanisms to track projects and activities to determine what is working and what isn't working
  - Reporting requirements to assess and evaluate long-term contributions of projects
  - Development of models from successful projects, including web-accessible inventory of administrative 4 C's tools used, the context of their use, their outcomes, and any barriers encountered in their implementation
- Projects must broaden decision space for citizen partners; specifically:
  - Projects should have the broadest possible latitude for citizen participation
  - Projects should be developed consistent with statute; policy, guidance and rules should be reviewed and, when appropriate, amended to remove unnecessary barriers to project and activity implementation and shared stewardship
  - Projects should include RAC participation in project design, development, implementation, monitoring and reporting
- Projects must be administered at the field office level but should have full access to Departmental support, including:
  - Guidance on administrative options and tools for project design and implementation through the Coordinator and the 4 C's Working Group
  - Access to and guidance from Solicitor's Office, regional and in Washington
  - Outreach support from Office of External and Inter-Governmental Affairs
  - In general, high visibility support for 4 C's activities from Secretary, Assistant Secretaries (L/M and PMB) and BLM Director (speeches, meetings, OpEds, feature articles and other forms of recognition)

- Projects must include active and continuous role for State Directors
  - State Directors' support and participation is integral to success of each State's 4 C's projects; State Directors must be regularly updated and informed on projects
  - Incentives for State Directors' support and participation must be clarified and communicated; they include:
    - Potential access to additional funding (e.g., availability of targeted funds for projects supported within the 4 C's Initiative)
    - Opportunity to learn and be more successful in expanding and implementing resource conservation programs
    - Opportunity to be significant change agent within agency
    - Access to administrative tools for development of citizen stewardship options
    - Greater recognition within the agency and the Department
    - Higher or enhanced performance evaluations through innovative leadership and creative 4 C's problem solving
  - State Directors should be included in project oversight, including project tracking, project annual review, and RAC and Coordinator consultations
- Projects that involve multiple agency jurisdictions or that entail integrated planning and implementation by multiple agencies and partners, should be encouraged; specifically:
  - Field Managers should take lead in coordination; State Directors should provide support
  - Multi-agency projects, to the extent they promote the 4 C's and landscape level management, should have priority in special funding support, if available
- Projects should address all relevant fiscal considerations, including:
  - Partners should, to the extent possible, determine and address in advance of implementation any and all liability issues related to project operations
  - Partners should develop business plans for the life of their projects or at a minimum for five years to account for funding uncertainties
- The 4 C's Initiative must operate within the administrative boundaries set by existing law; specifically:
  - The Department should perform risk assessment for the 4 C's Initiative to determine the parameters in which it is willing or able to accept risk: *what are the limits to which existing statutes can be interpreted to facilitate 4 C's innovation and how close to those limits is the Department prepared to go?* This assessment should include:
    - Providing guidance and direction to partners
    - Minimizing unwanted challenge and litigation
  - The Department should identify the primary legal sideboards within which administrative flexibility can be exercised and innovation in the field pursued; this will
    - Provide guidance and direction for 4 C's tool use
    - Provide foundation for development of new 4 C's tools

- The 4 C's Initiative should be subject to sunset provisions and its participating projects continuously assessed to determine ongoing support by the BLM; specifically
  - Consistent with its purpose of institutionalization, the 4 C's Initiative – *as a formalized support service within the bureau* – should be terminated at the end of 5 years unless a justification for its renewal is provided, documented and shown to be necessary to meet its mission, goal and objectives
  - 4 C's projects should be continuously evaluated for eligibility for ongoing support
    - Projects should not be supported for reasons of habit or inertia; continued support is contingent on project performance and assessment and future project contributions to the mission, goal and objectives of the program
    - Initial project implementations should have a specified time period to reach minimum benchmarks; success or failure in meeting those benchmarks will determine subsequent project support
    - Exit strategies and benchmarks – the points at which projects have met or cannot reasonably meet performance outcomes – will be established for projects supported within the 4 C's Initiative and exercised at the option of the Coordinator in consultation with partners, RACs and other oversight entities as may exist