

Record of Decision

King Range National Conservation Area Resource Management Plan

Prepared by
Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Arcata Field Office

 4-14-05
Lynda Roush Date
Recommended
Bureau of Land Management
Field Manager, Arcata, CA

 5/11/05
Mike Pool Date
Approved
Bureau of Land Management
State Director, California

 4/14/05
Gary Pritchard-Peterson Date
Recommended
Bureau of Land Management
King Range NCA Manager

RECORD OF DECISION

I. Decision

This Record of Decision (ROD) culminates a two and one-half year public planning process. After considering public comments, best available scientific and technical information, and results of consultation with Federal and state agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribal government, it is the decision of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to approve the Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the King Range National Conservation Area (NCA).

The Proposed RMP and Final Environmental Impact Statement was issued in November, 2004 and is available on BLM's web site at: <http://www.ca.blm.gov/arcata/kingrange>

Specific management direction for lands within the planning area is given in Chapter 4 of the Proposed RMP. The major decisions are summarized below in this ROD.

Update King Range NCA 1974 Management Program Management Zones & King Range RMP Zones.

The King Range Act directed development of a plan that identifies primary and secondary uses that will be permitted in various portions of the area. To implement this direction, the 1974 Management Program identified seven management zones. The present planning effort consolidated and simplified these original zones into three management zones. The zoning of the area allows the BLM to meet the intent of the King Range Act while accommodating a broader array of public uses and management goals and minimizing conflicts and resource impacts.

Table 1 – Management Zones

King Range 1974 Mgmt. Program	Primary use	King Range RMP Management Zone
1. Punta Gorda	Recreation	Backcountry
2. West Slope	Recreation/retain wild and scenic qualities	Backcountry
3. Shelter Cove	Residential	Residential
4. Point No Pass	Recreation/preserve primitive qualities.	Backcountry
5. Whale Gulch	Residential	Frontcountry
6. Bear Creek	Timber production/sustained yield forestry	Frontcountry
7. Honeydew Creek	Wildlife/fish habitat, especially threatened species.	Backcountry/ Frontcountry ¹

¹ The roadless core of the Honeydew Creek watershed was incorporated into the Backcountry Zone with the remainder of the watershed in the Frontcountry Zone.

The zones are described as follows:

Backcountry: The Backcountry Zone is essentially roadless, with a primary management goal focused on conserving the wilderness characteristics of the primitive western coastal slope and the adjoining undeveloped portions of the Honeydew and Squaw Creek Drainages. This zone is the core of the King Range NCA and California's "Lost Coast", providing a primary use of wildland recreation while protecting resources such as old-growth forests, old-growth forest dependent species, and open coastal grasslands. This environmental setting offers the greatest opportunity for solitude and challenge to area visitors. Management activities will follow the "minimum-tool" concept to maintain and restore natural functioning ecosystem components.

Frontcountry: The Frontcountry Zone forms an interface between the Backcountry Zone and surrounding private lands. It represents a broad mix of uses and tools for management. This is the zone where the most active resource restoration actions will occur, with key goals of developing a more natural vegetation mosaic in previously harvested forest stands, and improving watershed and fisheries health. Protection of private lands adjoining the King Range NCA from wildfire risk will also be a primary focus. On-the-ground management activities will include forest stand improvement, fuels reduction work, fire break construction, or use of heavy equipment for watershed restoration. Public uses in the Frontcountry Zone will include a broad array of motorized and nonmotorized activities.

Residential: This zone represents the town of Shelter Cove, which is mostly private land except for beachfront lots and coastal greenspace managed by the BLM. The King Range NCA's most highly developed recreation sites are in this zone, and the primary uses and management goals focus on recreation and resource protection of the important coastal access/greenspace values.

Many of the RMP management goals, objectives and associated actions and allowable uses are zone-specific, while others apply to all zones.

Resource Program Decisions

Management decisions in the form of goals, objectives, and associated allowable uses have been adopted for all resource programs in the King Range. Following are summaries of key elements of the adopted management direction described in Chapter 4 of the Proposed RMP for each program area.

a) Visual Resource Management (VRM)

Apply the BLM Visual Resource Management program to all activities to ensure that visual effects of activities are managed according to guidelines for specific VRM classes. The Backcountry Zone will be managed as Class I, the Frontcountry Zone divided into Class II and III, and the Residential Zone as Class III.

b) Cultural and Historic Resources

Prevent human-caused disturbance to cultural resources through site monitoring and educational and interpretive programs.

Complete cultural resources surveys for all unsurveyed lands within the King Range NCA, especially inland areas.

Nominate the King Range NCA archaeological district and historic ranching district to the National Register of Historic Places.

Maintain working relationships with local Native American tribes to protect culturally significant resources and reestablish traditional uses of resources.

c) Lands and Realty

Acquire lands with high public resource values to meet King Range NCA management goals including public recreation and resource conservation.

Coordinate with local governments and community groups in determining acquisition priorities.

Acquire water rights necessary to ensure conservation of resource values in the planning area.

No utility rights-of-way will be issued in the Backcountry Zone.

d) Wilderness Study Areas and Areas with Wilderness Characteristics

Continue management of King Range and Chemise Mountain WSAs to protect wilderness values.

Incorporate five acquired inholding parcels totaling 200 acres into the WSAs.

Manage 38,833 acres to protect wilderness characteristics (Backcountry Zone management unit).

e) Wild and Scenic Rivers

The following stream segments were found suitable for designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act:

Wild: Main stem Bear Creek, Big Creek, Big Flat Creek, Honeydew Creek, Gitchell Creek.

Scenic: Mattole River and Estuary, Mill Creek, South Fork Bear Creek (segment north of Shelter Cove Road), North Fork Bear Creek.

Recreational: South Fork Bear Creek (segment south of Shelter Cove Road).

Manage all suitable stream segments consistent with BLM policy to protect free-flowing characteristics, outstandingly remarkable values and to prevent classification impacts.

f) Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)/Research Natural Areas (RNA)

Continue management of the Mattole ACEC to protect significant archaeological sites, dune ecosystems, and riparian/wildlife values.

Establish the Mill Creek Watershed ACEC/RNA to protect the water quality and old growth forest values in the watershed.

Establish supplementary rules to provide special protection to the values of these areas.

g) Aquatic Ecosystems and Fisheries

Maintain and restore habitat necessary to support healthy riparian, aquatic and wetland ecosystems.

This ROD clarifies that watershed restoration activities will be focused on Mattole River tributaries containing federally listed species and critical habitat (coho and Chinook salmon and steelhead trout). Restoration activities in other watersheds are not precluded by the RMP, but will not be the management focus.

h) Wildlife

Establish sufficient northern spotted owl habitat to support 20 breeding pairs within the King Range NCA.

Maintain and enhance suitable habitat for bald eagles, western snowy plovers and marbled murrelets should they colonize sites in the King Range.

Minimize disturbance to stellar sea lions and brown pelicans in cooperation with the California Coastal National Monument.

Manage migratory bird, herpetofauna, and game species habitat to host natural population levels of these species.

Support interagency native species reintroduction efforts consistent with management goals of this RMP. Non-native species will not be introduced or encouraged.

i) Terrestrial Ecosystems and Vegetation

Manage vegetation types to produce a mosaic of plant communities that existed prior to the era of mechanized logging and exclusion of fire regimes in the region (approximately 1945).

Maintain the occurrence of federally listed *Layia carnosa* (beach layia) in the Mattole Beach dunes in accordance with the species recovery plan.

Maintain ongoing efforts to map, monitor and eradicate invasive non-native plant species.

j) Forest Management

Maintain and develop forest vegetation based on historical conditions prior to 1945 (approximately 60 percent late successional, 20 percent mid mature, and 20 percent early successional stands).

Maintain undisturbed late-successional forest habitat by keeping those stands intact.

Silvicultural treatments will be employed in the Frontcountry and Residential zones to accelerate development of cutover stands into late successional characteristics.

Conduct silvicultural treatments to make forests more resistant to stand replacing fire.

Follow forest management standards and guidelines consistent with those in the Northwest Forest Plan, and specific to the forest resources of the King Range NCA.

k) Special Forest Products

Provide special forest product permits for collection of mushrooms, floral trade species and other forest products at a sustainable level.

Firewood permits will not be issued for the Backcountry Zone, Riparian Reserves, Mattole Estuary or Mill Creek ACEC.

Establish a Native American beargrass collecting area and prohibit commercial collecting in this area.

l) Grazing Management

Maintain the existing four active grazing leases and associated allotments representing a total of 2,050 Animal Unit Months (AUM) of forage.

Change the boundary of the Spanish Flat Allotment to protect cultural resources. (This will not affect allocated AUM's of the allotment).

Change land use allocation to make four expired leases unavailable for livestock grazing.

m) Fire Management

Backcountry Zone: Manage fuels to allow various intensity wildfires and to create a landscape resistant to damages associated with large high intensity wildfires.

Frontcountry and Residential Zones: Use prescribed fire and mechanical fuel reduction to reduce potential for high intensity fires.

Develop a shaded fuel break system to provide a defensible perimeter around the Backcountry Zone and minimize the need for construction of bulldozer lines during fire events.

n) Transportation and Access

Provide a transportation network for public and administrative access to the Frontcountry and Residential Zones. Manage the Backcountry Zone as a non-mechanized use area. The following use requirements apply to these specific areas:

- Open year-round to all vehicle types: Prosper Ridge, Nooning Creek, King Range Roads.
- Open year-round to 4-wheel drive vehicles: Paradise Ridge, Finley Ridge, Saddle Mountain Roads.
- Open seasonally (closed in winter): Smith-Etter, Windy Point, Etter Roads.
- Motorized boating use is not allowed in the Mattole Estuary and motorized boat landings are not allowed along the Backcountry Zone coastline.

o) Recreation Management

Backcountry Zone: Provide high quality non-mechanized recreation opportunities consistent with managing the Backcountry Zone to protect wilderness characteristics.

- Provide minimal facilities for visitor safety and resource protection

- Provide a network of non-mechanized trails. Improve trail access for equestrians.
- Establish a use allocation system within five years of plan implementation to ensure that experience/resource quality is maintained.
- Allow mountain biking under special permit on four trails totaling 23 miles (Buck Creek, Spanish Ridge, Kinsey Ridge and Cooskie Creek). This will be a temporary use permitted until a trail system is developed in the Frontcountry Zone.

Frontcountry Zone: Provide high quality motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities that complement the adventurous nature and rustic character of the “Lost Coast”.

- Emphasize uses such as mountain biking, car camping and scenic driving that are not available in the Backcountry Zone.
- Establish a non-motorized loop trail system designed for mountain bikes in the Paradise Ridge area.
- Develop trails of lower gradient/difficulty to complement existing trail system.
- Limit dispersed camping around the Mattole Campground to areas specified in the RMP and associated supplemental rules (to be published). This ROD clarifies and specifies that dispersed camping is also not permitted at the “Mattole Ranch Complex” and adjoining lands. This site is on a bluff immediately south of the developed Mattole Campground. Camping at the Mattole Ranch Complex will be limited to groups authorized under BLM permit.

Residential Zone: Provide coastal access and greenspace in the community of Shelter Cove, and offer environmental education/coastal access and interpretive opportunities.

- Provide group use facilities at Mal Coombs Park.

p) Interpretation and Education.

Provide current, accurate and descriptive information to visitors to facilitate positive, safe experiences with minimal impacts.

Engage visitors to learn about the cultural and natural resources of the “Lost Coast”, and stewardship opportunities.

Supplemental Rules

This ROD carries forward all supplemental rules currently in effect for the King Range NCA. Supplemental rules apply to vehicle use, camping limitations, bear canister requirements, off-highway vehicle designations and other activities. In addition, several new supplemental rules are proposed and will become effective upon final publication in the Federal Register. These proposed rules can be found in Appendix B of the Proposed RMP.

II. Alternatives Including the Proposed Action

Alternatives Analyzed in the RMP

Four management alternatives were analyzed for the Proposed RMP and Final Environmental Impact Statement. The alternatives were developed by the BLM on the basis of, and in response to, substantive public input on the existing environment, existing uses, desired future uses, and desired environmental conditions of the King Range National Conservation Area. The alternatives considered in the EIS are summarized below:

Alternative A: No Action Alternative A is a continuation of current management as the “no action” alternative, and was developed from available inventory data, existing planning decisions and policies, and existing land use allocations and programs as contained in the 1974 King Range Management Program and amendments.

Alternative B: Of the action alternatives, Alternative B represents the most “hands off” approach, emphasizing the utilization of natural processes wherever possible and minimizing human impacts. This will result in low levels of active involvement in resource restoration and management, and limited recreation use focused on providing maximum opportunities for solitude and wilderness-type experiences.

Alternative C: Alternative C provides a greater diversity of uses and approaches to management, with a broad mix of tools and moderate levels of use allowed.

Alternative D: Alternative D takes a more active approach, allowing maximum use while still maintaining and enhancing resource conditions. It includes the widest application of management tools and actions including restoration, and provides higher levels of recreation use with fewer opportunities for solitude than the other alternatives.

Preferred Alternative

The Preferred Alternative was selected from this range of reasonable options, and represents an effort to provide balance in managing both resources and uses of the King Range. Issues considered during this development process include: environmental impacts of the alternatives; issues raised throughout the planning process; specific environmental values, resources, and resource uses; conflict resolution; public input; and laws and regulations.

Environmentally Preferred Alternative

Federal regulations (40 CFR 1505.2 (b)) require that an agency identify the “environmentally preferable” alternative or alternatives in the ROD. Table 2 below compares the RMP preferred/selected alternative and environmentally preferable alternative for each of the major resource programs contained in the Proposed RMP.

Table 2 – RMP Selected Alternative/Environmentally Preferred Alternative

Resource Program	RMP Preferred/Selected Alternative	Environmentally Preferable Alternative
Visual Resource Management	Alternative C	Alternative B
Cultural and Historic Resources	Alternative D	Alternative D
Lands and Realty		
a) Acquisition	Alternative C	Alternative C
b) Water Rights/rights of way	Alternative B/C²	Alternative B
Wilderness Characteristic Inventory Units	Alternative C/D	Alternative B
Wild and Scenic Rivers	Alternative C/D	Alternative B
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	Alternative C	Alternative C
Acquatic Ecosystems and Fisheries	Alternative C	Alternative D
Wildlife	Alternative C	Alternative D
Terrestrial Ecosystems and Vegetation	Alternative C	Alternative C
Forest Management	Alternative D	Alternative D
Special Forest Products	Alternative C	Alternative B
Grazing Management	Alternative C	Alternative B
Fire Management	Alternative C	Alternative C
Transportation and Access	Alternative C	Alternative B
Recreation Management	Alternative C	Alternative B
Interpretation and Education	Alternative A	Alternative A

The preferred package of alternatives was chosen to balance public needs with environmental protection, and a major focus of the RMP is to restore and improve environmental conditions within the planning area. None of the selected alternatives will result in significant environmental impacts, or irreversible-irretrievable impacts.

² Where more than one alternative is listed (e. g. B/C) the selected alternative incorporated components of two alternatives from the Draft RMP. These changes are described in the section below titled “Changes incorporated into the Proposed RMP.”

III. Management Considerations/Decision Rationale

The King Range NCA's 35-mile coastline conserves one of America's most dramatic landscapes. Miles of trails offer opportunities for visitors to recreate in a unique coastal backcountry setting. Only two other locations on the Continental U. S. coastline offer comparable backcountry recreation opportunities. The King Range provides critical habitat for the late successional forest dependent species, and offers an opportunity to support the southernmost viable population of northern spotted owls on the Pacific Coast. The area is also a refuge for federally listed salmonids and is the focus of extensive community-led fishery restoration efforts. As California's "Lost Coast" region is increasingly discovered by a growing population, finding a balance between use and protection of the area's significant values is the BLM's goal in reaching a decision on the RMP.

This RMP decision was based on the following factors:

- Provides management zones that allow for a diversity of uses of the King Range including non-motorized and motorized recreation, special forest product gathering, grazing, and commercial uses.
- Addresses community concerns regarding retention of the area's undeveloped "Lost Coast" character, provision of opportunities for community involvement in area management, and sets goals for reduction of wildfire threats/fuel loading.
- Maintains or improves conditions of special status species and other unique natural and cultural resources.
- Improves late-successional forest habitat as called for under the Northwest Forest Plan, and is otherwise consistent with this plan.
- Provides an extensive monitoring and habitat enhancement program for various listed species. Also is consistent with and incorporates any conservation recommendations requested by Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinions.
- Consistent with all legislation and policies guiding management of the King Range NCA.

BLM's approval of the RMP responds to the multiple use requirements as stated in the King Range Act of 1970 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. The King Range Act directs the BLM to complete a "comprehensive, balanced, and coordinated plan of land use, development, and management of the area . . . that the plan will indicate the primary or dominant uses that will be permitted on various portions of the area . . . and that secondary uses may be permitted to the extent that they are compatible with and do not unduly impair the primary or dominant uses. . ." (Public Law 91-476).

Changes incorporated into Proposed RMP

The primary concern expressed by the public throughout the RMP process was the importance of retaining the area's primitive character. The RMP goals, objectives, actions and allowable uses focus on meeting this central theme, while accommodating a variety of public needs for use of area resources. The BLM received 862 comments on the draft RMP

and Environmental Impact Statement. After considering all of the submitted comments, the BLM determined that the selection of the preferred alternative in the Draft RMP was still appropriate with the following exceptions:

- Added North Fork and Main Stem of Bear Creek as suitable for Wild and Scenic River designation.
- Expanded the Backcountry Zone boundary to include the Squaw Creek Drainage.
- Changed zoning of BLM land adjoining northern part of Shelter Cove Subdivision from Residential to Frontcountry Zone.
- Excluded commercial mushroom and all fuelwood permits from Mill Creek ACEC/RNA.
- Increased the permitted number of stock animals (horses, llamas, goats etc.) to allow a maximum group size of 25 (people/stock combined count) .
- Changed northern part of Frontcountry Zone from Visual Resource Management Class III to II.
- Mountain bike use will not be not permitted on Backcountry Zone trails. A provision is included to allow temporary bike use under permit on several trails while a trail system is developed in the Frontcountry Zone.
- Take a more active role in BLM assertion of water-rights, and requiring stipulations of water rights-of-way to minimize in-stream flow reductions and impacts to salmonids.
- Clarified language to emphasize that all forest management treatments will be completed only when they provide a demonstrated benefit (as determined through site specific environmental assessments) to improvement of late successional habitat.

Protests

Four protests were received on the Proposed RMP/Final Environmental Impact Statement. In response to the protests, BLM has corrected errors in the Proposed RMP and Final Environmental Impact Statement and has provided further clarification for the related decisions. These corrections and clarifications are described below. The protest responses represent the final decision of the Department of the Interior.

- Errors in Appendix D are acknowledged. One protest stated that 13 west slope streams including both Oat and Buck Creek contain populations of steelhead trout. BLM agrees with the protestor. These values were omitted on the tables in the eligibility determination in Appendix D of the Proposed RMP. However, the eligibility determinations for designation as wild and scenic are not affected by this omission.
- This ROD clarifies the rationale for a proposed phase-out of mountain biking in the King Range and Chemise Mountain Wilderness Study Areas and Backcountry Zone. One protest questioned BLM's basis for this action. In reviewing the RMP and related documents, BLM concluded that the phase-out of mountain biking appropriately reflects the specific management goals for the area and is consistent

with applicable national policy. The recreation management goal in the proposed RMP is to “Provide high quality non-mechanized recreational opportunities consistent with managing the Backcountry Zone to protect wilderness characteristics.” The RMP goals were developed to be consistent with the King Range Act and BLM management policies including the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review. The beaches, west slope and coastal peaks of the King Range (which encompass the existing trail system) are a nationally significant resource as one of the only areas on the continental U. S. coastline retaining wilderness character. It was this primitive quality of California’s “Lost Coast” that led to the area’s designation as a NCA in 1970. Beginning with the initial King Range Management Program development in 1974, the BLM has consistently carried forward the management vision for this part of the King Range to protect its wilderness characteristics. In other parts of the King Range, including the proposed Frontcountry and Residential Zones, the BLM has made a commitment to provide for additional recreation uses including mountain biking.

IV. Mitigation and Monitoring

Approved mitigation measures were presented in Chapter 4 of the final EIS and in the Management Actions section of the Proposed RMP. All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm while still meeting the goals, purpose and need requirements for the proposed plan have been adopted. No significant environmental impacts were identified in the final EIS.

The ROD approves a comprehensive monitoring program. Monitoring will focus on evaluating the effectiveness of the RMP in managing and protecting the resource values of the area. Monitoring of biological resources will address species needs and will ensure BLM complies with the terms and conditions of the April 2005 Biological Opinions by the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. The Biological Opinions are incorporated by reference in this ROD. The monitoring program for biological resources is a dynamic program. Based on periodic reviews of the quality of the data collected and the usefulness of the data, it will be amended as necessary.

V. Agency and Public Participation

Public Involvement

The Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1501.7) and BLM planning regulations (43 CFR 1610) require an early and open process (scoping) for determining the planning issues. The regulations also require that agencies provide opportunity for public involvement in the planning process, including review of the draft Plan and draft EIS. Extensive efforts have been made to make the public aware of the planning process and of opportunities for involvement.

- **Public Scoping:** Public involvement in the RMP effort began with publication of a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on October 11, 2002. The scoping process for the project was designed to solicit input from stakeholders, the public, and other interested parties on the issues related to the development of an RMP.

The BLM conducted five public scoping meetings in November 2002. The meetings were held at the locations and dates described below:

Table 3 –Scoping Meetings

Location/Number of Participants	Date
Garberville, CA – 24 people	November 6, 2002
San Francisco, CA – 2 people	November 7, 2002
Eureka, CA – 42 people	November 13, 2002
Shelter Cove, CA – 24 people	November 14, 2002
Petrolia, CA – 33 people	November 16, 2002

The BLM also issued a press release announcing the scoping period and meetings to all media in northern California. An informational website was established which was maintained throughout the effort to provide background on the planning process, announcing opportunities for public involvement, and highlighting progress on the plan. Other tools used to communicate with interested parties included a “King Range Planning Update,” mailer, sent to all members of the King Range mailing list, and fliers posted on community bulletin boards in the rural region surrounding the King Range.

- **Public Review of the Draft EIS:** The draft EIS and RMP were released to the public for a 90-day comment period, ending April 16, 2004. During this review period five public meetings were held to explain the EIS and RMP to the public and to allow comment. The meetings were held in the same communities as the scoping meetings and are listed in the table below:

Table 4 – Draft RMP Public Meetings

Location	Date
Petrolia, CA (20 participants)	February 23, 2004
Eureka, CA (28 participants)	February 24, 2004
San Francisco, CA (9 participants)	February 26, 2004
Garberville, CA (7 participants)	March 3, 2004
Shelter Cove, CA (13 participants)	March 4, 2004

Participants were given the opportunity to provide oral comments at the meetings, or to record their input on public comment forms provided by the BLM.

BLM received 862 comments on the draft RMP and EIS from the public through public meetings, electronic letters and paper letters. Over 350 issues or “public concerns” were identified from these comments. A BLM interdisciplinary team reviewed these public concerns and developed written responses that were included in Chapter 5 of the Proposed RMP. The Proposed RMP and Final EIS were revised as needed. A summary of the issues identified in the public comment letters and BLM’s response to these issues is included in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. Also, letters from organizations and public agencies are reprinted in the document. Copies of letters from individuals are available for review at the BLM Arcata Field Office.

Endangered Species Act Consultation

Federal regulation (CFR, Volume 50, Part 402) implementing the provisions of Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), requires the BLM and other Federal agencies to consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)(for terrestrial and freshwater species), and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (for marine species) on projects, plans and actions that may negatively affect a threatened or endangered species. The FWS/NMFS then issue Biological Opinions relative to jeopardy and adverse modification.

The BLM began the consultation process by requesting a list of federally listed species known to occur in the region affected by the RMP effort from the FWS in September, 2002. The BLM in conjunction with FWS and the NMFS determined that the following species could be affected by the RMP and so would be addressed in a biological assessment:

Vascular Plants

- Beach Layia (*Layia carnosa*)
- Western Lily (*Lilium occidentale*)

Wildlife Species

Brown Pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis*)
Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)
Western Snowy Plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*)
Marbled Murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*)
Yellow-billed Cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*)
Northern Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*)
Pacific Fisher (*Martes pennanti pacificus*)
Steller's (Northern) Sea Lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*)

Fish Species

Southern Oregon/Northern California Coasts Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)
California Coastal Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
Northern California Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*)

Critical Habitat

Northern Spotted Owl, designated January 15, 1992
Marbled Murrelet, designated May 24, 1996
Southern Oregon/Northern California Coasts Coho Salmon, designated 1997
California Coastal Chinook Salmon, currently proposed for designation
Northern California Steelhead, currently proposed for designation

BLM's request for formal consultation on the proposed RMP regarding fish species was submitted to NMFS on November 10, 2004. BLM's request for formal consultation on wildlife/plant species was submitted to the FWS on January 24, 2005. Biological Opinions were received from FWS and NMFS for the proposed RMP on April 7, 2005 and April 27, 2005 respectively.

State of California Consistency Requirements

- **National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)** (Public Law 89-665). Under Section 106 of this law, consultation between BLM and the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) was initiated during the RMP scoping process in 2002. The SHPO was provided with copies of the Draft and Proposed RMPs, and submitted a comment letter supporting the RMP provisions related to cultural resources management.
- **Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)**(Public Law 92-583). The Federal Consistency Unit of the California Coastal Commission implements the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972 as it applies to federal activities, development projects, permits and licenses. Under the CZMA, Congress created a federal and state partnership for management of coastal resources. Upon certification of a state's coastal management program, a federal agency must

conduct its activities in a manner consistent with the state's certified program. The processes established to implement this requirement is called a consistency determination. The federal government certified the California Coastal Management Program (CCMP) in 1978. The Federal Consistency Unit of the California Coastal Commission prepared a Consistency Determination (CD-085-04) finding that the proposed RMP was consistent with the California Coastal Management Program. On January 12, 2005, the California Coastal Commission unanimously concurred with the consistency determination.

- **Governor's Consistency Review** -- In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (Public Law 94-579), and with BLM planning regulations in 43 CFR 1610.3-2, BLM must identify any known inconsistencies with State or local plans, policies, or programs. BLM must also provide the Governor with up to 60 days in which to identify any inconsistencies and submit recommendations. The BLM submitted the Draft RMP to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit (Document # 2004014002). No state agencies commented to the Clearinghouse, and the BLM received a letter of confirmation that the RMP complied with state review requirements on April 16, 2004. No known inconsistencies have been identified, either by the BLM or the Governor, for the RMP decisions.

Consultation with Native Americans

To comply with Executive Orders regarding government-to-government relations with Native Americans, formal and informal contacts were made with the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Reservation, the Federally recognized tribal entity for consultation purposes. Tribal members participated in an RMP training session conducted for BLM and partner agencies/organizations in 2002. The tribe was provided with a copy of the draft RMP, and contacted directly by the BLM requesting comments/assessing the need for a tribal briefing. The tribe expressed no concerns about the RMP.

Other Consultations

A number of agencies and interests, including local, state and federal have been involved in the development of this plan. BLM coordinated with and included any agency that expressed an interest in the plan. The BLM briefed/coordinated with the Humboldt County Planning Division to ensure consistency with local planning efforts and land use goals. In addition, Humboldt County Supervisors attended scoping meetings for the RMP. The California Department of Fish and Game, State Parks, and Department of Forestry and Fire Protection all participated in the RMP effort and were consulted on matters relating to their respective jurisdictions. The BLM Northwest California Resource Advisory Council was briefed at all major stages of the RMP effort and concurred with the plan. A copy of the Draft RMP was reviewed by the Environmental Protection Agency and received a rating of LO – "Lack of Objections".