



# United States Department of the Interior



## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

**California State Office**  
2800 Cottage Way, Suite W-1834  
Sacramento, California 95825  
www.ca.blm.gov

August 27, 2004

*In Reply Refer To:*  
6840 (CA930)P

EMS Transmission: 8/27/04  
Instruction Memorandum No. **CA-2004-056**  
Expires: 09/30/2005

**To:** Field Managers, Bakersfield, Folsom, Hollister, Alturas, Eagle Lake, Surprise, Ukiah, Palm Springs-South Coast, and El Centro

**From:** State Director

**Subject:** Timely Submission of the Status Reports Required for FY 2004 Endangered Species Act Consultation Work on Land Use Plans **DD: 10/01/04**

The Washington Office (WO-230) is currently investigating how selected BLM offices have used Congressional “add-on” funds over the past three years funds to reduce or eliminate the backlog of land use plan consultations associated with the *Pacific Rivers Council v. Thomas* ruling of the Ninth Circuit Court. Over the past three years, California-BLM has received nearly \$1.5 million in flexible funding to address our Endangered Species Act consultation backlog on existing land use plans and land use plan updates. As part of its ongoing program review of the Section 7 consultation backlog issue, WO-230 has scheduled a California site visit on October 13, 2004, to review our expenditures and accomplishments with respect to these Section 7 consultations. The findings by WO-230 staff will serve as the basis for a report to Congress later this year concerning BLM’s needs, expenditures, and accomplishments relative to this issue.

For CA-930 to be able to provide thorough and accurate responses to this WO-230 program review and data call, it is essential that the progress reports called for in the California FY 2004 Annual Work Plan be submitted on time.<sup>1</sup> It is also important that any labor charges to 1610 for work on Section 7 consultations involving existing land use plans or land use plan updates be properly coded. (See bold text in footnote below.) In FY 2004, fifteen California-BLM offices received 1610 flexible funds for work on land use plan consultations. Yet, only two offices have coded any of their 1610 labor charges to the SECS project code. All offices that received 1610 flexible funds in FY 2004 are directed to review their 1610 expenditures **and retroactively code**

---

<sup>1</sup>The General Directive for the 1610 subactivity states: “Each office receiving funds is required to submit a progress report at the end of the fiscal year identifying FY 2004 achievements, the status of their land use plan consultation(s), and the projected completion date(s). Such progress reports should be submitted to CA-930 (Attn: Ed Lorentzen) by October 1, 2004. **Any labor charged to 1610 for work involving Endangered Species Act consultations on land use plans should be coded to the appropriate “D” Program Element and also to the “SECS” special interest project code.**” (Emphasis added.)

**to special project code SECS** any FY 2004 charges associated with the work required to initiate or complete Section 7 consultation on an existing land use plan, land use plan update, or new plan start. Such retroactive corrections must be entered into MIS by fiscal year end for all employees whose labor charges to 1610 should have been coded to special project code SECS.

Potentially at stake if we are not able to properly account for the \$450,000 California-BLM received in FY 2004 to address our Section 7 consultation backlog is the \$410,000 tentatively allocated to California-BLM in the FY 2005 Planned Target Allocation. Also at stake, from the Bureau-wide perspective, is BLM's credibility with Congress if we are not able to demonstrate we are making effective and appropriate use of the funds Congress has appropriated to BLM for special agency needs, such as the additional workload associated with the *Pacific Rivers Council v. Thomas* decision of the Ninth Circuit Court.

For reference purposes, the offices that received flexible 1610 funds in FY 2004 for work on their Section 7 consultation backlog are shown below, along with the amounts allocated.

CA160	\$20,000	(Caliente RMP administrative boundary adjustment)
CA169	\$60,000	(Carrizo Plain National Monument RMP consultation)
CA180	\$35,000	(Sierra MFP – develop conservation strategies for Folsom RMP)
CA190	\$35,000	(Hollister RMP consultation – including Fort Ord-Coastal Dairies update)
CA310	\$35,000	(Oversight/coordination on NORCAL land use plan consultations)
CA320	\$35,000	(Consultation on Northeastern California land use plan update)
CA330	\$10,000	(Complete consultation on King Range Conservation Area RMP)
CA340	\$25,000	(Clear Lake MFP consultation/Ukiah RMP inventory & assessment)
CA350	\$35,000	(Consultation on Northeastern California land use plan update)
CA370	\$35,000	(Consultation on Northeastern California land use plan update)
CA610	\$10,000	(Oversight/coordination on CDD land use plan consultations)
CA660	\$10,000	(South Coast RMP reinitiation and Coachella Valley amendment)
CA670	\$30,000	(WECO plan amendment; Imperial Dunes RAMP; Eastern SD County MFP)
CA930	\$40,000	(Assistance on Imperial Dunes Section 7 & coordination on other LUP updates)
CA939	\$35,000	(California Coastal NM consultation)

Questions regarding this Instruction Memorandum may be directed to Ed Lorentzen at (916) 978-4646.

Signed by:  
James Wesley Abbott  
Associate State Director

Authenticated by:  
Richard A. Erickson  
Records Management

Distribution

District Manager, California Desert (Attn: Linda Hansen)  
Project Manager, California Coastal National Monument (Attn: Rick Hanks)  
Project Manager, Carrizo National Monument (Attn: Marlene Braun)  
Project Manager, Fort Ord (Attn: Eric Morgan)  
NorCal Supervisory Wildlife Biologist (Attn: Paul Roush)