



Consultation and Coordination

Welcome

You are now in the "Consultation and Coordination" chapter.
Here are the topics you can read about.

HISTORY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	457
THE SCOPING PROCESS	457
AGENCY CONSULTATION	459
LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONSULTANTS	463
LIST OF RECIPIENTS	465
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHARTER MOUNTAIN LAKES FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	468



HISTORY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The public involvement activities for this *Mountain Lakes Fishery Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* (plan/EIS) fulfill the requirements of the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) and National Park Service (NPS) *Director's Order 12* (NPS 2001b).

THE SCOPING PROCESS

The National Park Service divides the scoping process into two parts: internal scoping and external (public) scoping. Internal scoping for this plan/EIS involved discussions among NPS personnel regarding issues, management alternatives, mitigation measures, the analysis boundary, appropriate level of documentation, lead and cooperating agency roles, available references and guidance, defining the purpose and need for management actions, and other related dialogue.

Public scoping is the early involvement of the interested and affected public in the environmental analysis process. The public scoping process helps ensure that people have been given an opportunity to comment and contribute early in the decision-making process. For this plan/EIS, project information was distributed to individuals, agencies, and organizations early in the scoping process, and people were given opportunities to express concerns or views and identify important issues or even other alternatives.

Taken together, internal and public scoping are essential elements of the NEPA planning process. The following sections describe the various ways the NPS conducted internal and public scoping for this plan/EIS.

INTERNAL SCOPING

This process began on July 16, 2002, at North Cascades Complex Headquarters in Sedro-Woolley, Washington. During the two-day meeting, the NPS identified the purpose of and need for action, management objectives, issues, and impact topics. It was determined that a Technical Advisory Committee should be established to ensure an interdisciplinary, science-based approach to management. Various roles and responsibilities for developing the fishery management plan were also clarified, including the need for the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) to be a cooperating agency. The results of the meetings were captured in an internal scoping report, now on file as part of the administrative record.

On October 1, 2002, the NPS and WDFW met to discuss the proposed plan/EIS. The discussions included an overview of the NEPA process, a clarification of the purpose of the environmental impact statement and its relationship to a mountain lakes fishery management plan, and the composition and function of the Technical Advisory Committee. During the meeting, information gaps and data

management needs were identified, and it was agreed that public scoping and the environmental impact analysis process should be initiated.

Following the first NPS/WDFW coordination meeting, a Technical Advisory Committee of subject matter experts was chartered to advise and provide technical recommendations to the NPS on matters regarding scientific data and analysis. The committee met periodically to review and supplement necessary background information and data needed for this plan/EIS. The committee also recommended impact analysis techniques and various management options and provided technical review of draft documents related to this plan/EIS process. The first of eight Technical Advisory Committee meetings for this plan/EIS was held on November 14, 2002.

*Members of the
Technical Advisory Committee*

National Park Service, Environmental Quality Division

National Park Service, North Cascades Complex

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

PUBLIC SCOPING

Public scoping formally began on January 16, 2003, with the *Federal Register* publication of the notice of intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental impact statement (Federal Register Vol. 68 (11), pp. 2355–2356). The notice of intent summarized the history of fishery management in the North Cascades Complex, discussed preliminary issues and management actions, listed the project website (www.nps.gov/NOCA/highlakes.htm), and announced the public scoping meetings. A number of federal, state, local, and tribal entities were directly contacted, as well as organizations expressing an interest in the plan/EIS.

In March 2003, the NPS and WDFW held four public scoping meetings to discuss issues and management alternatives for this plan/EIS.

The Washington State locations for the four public scoping meetings were

Sedro-Woolley, March 18, 2003 (21 people attended)

Wenatchee, March 20, 2003 (5 people attended)

Bellevue, March 25, 2003 (21 people attended)

Seattle, March 27, 2003 (25 people attended)

The two- to three-hour scoping meetings were held in an open house format. The meetings began with a 30-minute presentation in which NPS and WDFW biologists discussed preliminary issues, the EIS process, and expectations for the meeting. Following the presentation, the participants broke into smaller work



groups where facilitators assisted in discussions about issues, objectives, and preliminary alternatives. Public comments and concerns were recorded. The public comment period ended on April 18, 2003.

Issues and concerns were captured at public meetings and in subsequent written comments and emails. A Public Scoping Report was prepared based on these comments and is part of the administrative record for this plan/EIS. Formally, the NPS received more than 160 comments during the scoping meetings and from letters sent to the NPS.

The NPS used these comments in developing this plan/EIS. Based in part on public comment, the Technical Advisory Committee determined the need to perform the lake-by-lake analysis because each lake is so unique. Criteria used in the lake-by-lake analysis included fishing potential ratings assigned by user groups. The public also expressed a concern that the analysis occur on a landscape scale, so the Technical Advisory Committee took a broad look at lakes in the North Cascades Complex and selected a representative number of lakes to remain fishless under each alternative (see the “Alternatives” chapter for details about the alternatives).

Public Notification

The notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement was published in the *Federal Register* on January 16, 2003.

A brochure was mailed in early March 2003 to the project’s preliminary mailing list of government agencies, organizations, businesses, and individuals. The brochure summarized the purpose of and need for a fishery management plan for the North Cascades Complex, the objectives for this plan/EIS, and history of mountain lakes fishery management. The brochure also contained important information (dates/times/locations) about the public scoping meetings.

A project website (www.nps.gov/noca/highlakes.htm) was created in January 2003 and is periodically updated with new information.

A news release for the public scoping meetings was sent on February 14, 2003, to the following news media: Seattle Times, Seattle Post Intelligencer, Chelan Mirror, Wenatchee World, Associated Press, Everett Herald, River Post, Argus, Spokane Chronicle, Bellingham Herald, Skagit Valley Herald, and Lynden Tribune.

AGENCY CONSULTATION

U S D A — F O R E S T S E R V I C E

Mount Baker-Snoqualmie, Wenatchee, and Okanogan National Forests adjoin the North Cascades Complex. The Forest supervisors for these units have been regularly briefed on research results and the planning process. The forests have chosen not to be directly involved in the planning process for this plan/EIS,



having stated that the WDFW manages the mountain lakes fishery on Forest Service lands.

WASHINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Consultation with the WDFW began with a meeting in Sedro-Woolley, Washington, on October 1, 2002. During the meeting, it was determined that Mark Downen, inland fisheries biologist, would be the principal representative for the department. Mr. Downen requested that Bob Pfeifer, currently with the WDFW (formerly an inland fisheries management biologist and high lakes fishery manager with WDFW), also be involved because of his extensive experience in mountain lakes fishery management. The WDFW agreed to serve as a cooperating agency in the NEPA process. The regional director for the WDFW, Bob Everitt, is the principal contact for policy issues, and the inland fisheries biologist, Mark Downen, is the contact for technical issues. The correspondence documenting the role of the department as a cooperating agency is contained in the project's administrative record.

On July 17, 2003, Roy Zipp, Natural Resources Specialist of the North Cascades Complex, consulted with Cynthia Pratt, the WDFW coordinator for *Washington State Environmental Protection Act* (SEPA) and NEPA issues, to determine whether the NEPA process would suffice for the Washington SEPA. Ms. Pratt followed up the phone conversation in writing with SEPA-related materials and guidance for producing an environmental impact statement that meets the SEPA requirements.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY

Discussions with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) began following their review of the notice of intent. Tom Connor, EPA environmental specialist, requested (via a telephone conversation with Roy Zipp on March 6, 2003) that he be included in all email correspondence. Mr. Connor also requested that the NPS include in their impact analysis (1) water quality, nonnative fish as pollutants; and (2) impacts to bull trout from downstream dispersal. Mr. Connor also recommended consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service. Since that initial phone call, Mr. Connor was included on all email correspondence, including Technical Advisory Committee discussions. In a subsequent phone conversation between Roy Zipp and Tom Connor on July 17, 2003, Mr. Connor and Mr. Zipp discussed the need to document, in writing, that EPA had been consulted. Mr. Connor said that such written documentation was not necessary; continued dialogue via email would suffice, and he was looking forward to reviewing the draft plan/EIS.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was first notified of the proposed plan/EIS for the North Cascades Complex at the start of the scoping process. Letters were



sent to several regional offices and various personnel. No comments or feedback were received. Informal consultations with the service began in the summer of 2003, with a written request for an up-to-date species list and any information on the current status on the westslope cutthroat trout. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service requires a biological assessment that evaluates the impacts of proposed actions on listed species. They also recommended evaluating impacts to candidate species, since those species could be listed in the future. The service suggested that federal agencies, particularly the NPS, should be proactive in its efforts to prevent listing of species. Both the letter of request from the NPS and the reply from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are included in appendix C. Also included in appendix C are tables listing special status species in the North Cascades Complex. Discussions with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service continue, with Linda Saunders as the principal contact.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

Informal consultations with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) began in the summer of 2003 with a telephone conversation with Tom Sibley of the Habitat Conservation Division. Mr. Sibley recommended that the NPS evaluate impacts to Chinook salmon (threatened) and Coho salmon (candidate). When asked if the National Marine Fisheries Service would like to receive a written request for their input, Mr. Sibley stated that the phone dialogue would suffice and pledged further technical assistance with the biological assessment, as needed.

NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

A public scoping letter requesting input was sent to the following tribes on March 31, 2003: Yakama Nation, Skagit System Cooperative, Nlakapamux National Tribal Council, Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe, Nooksack Tribal Office, and Colville Confederated Tribes. Mr. Larry Campbell, of the Swinomish Tribe, was the single tribal representative who responded during public scoping. Mr. Campbell expressed the concern that if any ground disturbance could occur from high lakes fishing activities, there should be compliance with section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act*.

Further consultations with the Skagit and Swinomish tribes were conducted by park archeologist, Bob Mierendorf, to determine whether or not the widespread belief that stocking is a modern practice that was not performed by native people. All responded that they had never heard of stocking prior to European settlement, though several individuals suggested it might have been possible. Based on this response, the decision was made to dismiss ethnographic resources, including the cultural practice of stocking, as an issue in this plan/EIS.

WASHINGTON STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

The Washington State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) was consulted in the summer of 2003 regarding their cultural resource and ethnographic concerns



related to mountain lakes fishery management. The SHPO did not envision any concerns for the various actions under consideration but expressed interest in receiving appropriate correspondence.

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Early in the planning process, the U.S. Geological Service (USGS) Forest Range and Experiment Station expressed its decision to not be involved in this plan/EIS in order to maintain scientific objectivity. This is because scientists from the USGS and Oregon State University completed a long-term research study to determine how continued stocking practices would affect native biota in mountain lakes in the North Cascades Complex (see the “Purpose of and Need for Action” chapter for a summary of how that research was used in this plan/EIS). Informal discussions with various staff members from the U.S. Geological Service have occurred throughout the planning process. These discussions have served to clarify elements of their research findings and on gathering additional data and information to support this plan/EIS.



LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONSULTANTS

Name	Title	Education/ Responsibility	Experience
National Park Service			
Roy Zipp	Natural Resource Specialist	B.A. Biology / Chemistry, M.S. Environmental Management (emphasis in water and air resources). Responsible for: park lead for project oversight; member, Technical Advisory Committee.	10 years
Ronald C. Holmes	Ecologist/Data Manager	M.S. Terrestrial Ecology. Responsible for: member, Technical Advisory Committee; compiling and maintaining mountain lakes database.	30 years
Reed Glesne	Supervisory Aquatic Ecologist	B.S. Natural Resources, M.S. Biology. Responsible for: member, Technical Advisory Committee; technical review.	30 years
David Jacob	Environmental Protection Specialist	J.D., Law; B.A., History. Responsible for: background / history and policy	2 years
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife			
Mark Downen	Inland Fisheries Biologist	B.S., M.S. Environmental Science. Responsible for: member, Technical Advisory Committee; technical review.	6 years
Bob Pfeifer (formerly with Parametrix)	Inland Fisheries Management Biologist, Habitat Biologist	B.S., Biology, M.S., Fisheries. Responsible for: member, Technical Advisory Committee; technical review.	32 years
URS Corporation			
Nancy Van Dyke	Senior Consultant	B.A. Biology and Geography, M.S. Environmental Sciences. Responsible for: aquatic organisms, wildlife, special status species, general technical review	25 years
Patti Steinholtz	Writer / Editor, Communication Technician, and NEPA Planner.	B.A. Communications and English. Responsible for: general technical review.	9 years
Kim Cornelisse	Staff Wildlife Biologist	B.A. Biology. Responsible for: wildlife, special status species.	7 years
Wesley Toland	Staff Scientist	B.S. Environmental Studies. Responsible for: chapter 2 and appendix table reviews.	4 years
Rob Nielsen	Project Fisheries / Wildlife Biologist	Ph.D. Fisheries, M.S. Fisheries, B.S. Fisheries and Wildlife Science. Responsible for: fisheries/wildlife biology and habitat analysis.	30 years
Eric Doyle	Fisheries Biologist, Aquatic Ecologist	B.S. Marine Biology, Chemistry, M.M.A. Marine Affairs. Responsible for: developing the impacts assessment for plankton and macroinvertebrates.	7 years



Name	Title	Education/ Responsibility	Experience
Thomas G. Campbell	Senior Project Ecologist	B.S. Zoology, M.S. Marine Biology. Responsible for: coauthor of the monitoring plan and data consistency review.	28 years
T Q N E P A			
Heidi West	Principal	B.S. Biology, M.A. Science Communication, M.S. Biology, Ph.D. Environmental Science and Engineering. Responsible for: technical review.	22 years
Kathryn Joyner	Senior Analyst	B.S. Education, M.A. Archeology/Anthropology. Responsible for: cultural resources.	22 years
Erin Bissell	Natural Resources Analyst	B.S. Biology, Ph.D. Biology in progress. Responsible for: vegetation sections.	7 years
R E D , I n c . C o m m u n i c a t i o n s			
Susan Hale	Lead Technical Editor	Elementary Education, undergraduate courses. Responsible for: technical editing and publication management and coordination.	36 years
Juanita Barboa	Technical Editor	B.S. Technical Communication. Responsible for: technical editing and publication management and coordination.	14 years
Cheryl Priest	Desktop Publisher / Text Processor	Denver Medical and Business College. Responsible for: formatting and layout.	14 years
Matt Look	Graphic Artist	A.S. Graphic Design. Responsible for: map design, photo manipulation and design, and figure development.	10 years
Roy Reynolds	Illustrator	Art Center School. Responsible for: illustrations.	41 years
Kim Jacobson	Graphic Artist	B.F.A Graphic Design. Responsible for: cover and divider design.	24 years



LIST OF RECIPIENTS

This plan/EIS was sent to the agencies, organizations, and businesses listed below. This document was also mailed to other entities and individuals who requested a copy.

FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

National Marine Fisheries Service
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Forest Service, Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest
U.S. Forest Service, Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests
U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division

TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Nooksack Tribal Council
Sauk-Suiattle Tribe
Swinomish Indian Tribal Community
Upper Skagit Tribal Council

STATE OF WASHINGTON GOVERNMENT

United States Senate

Honorable Maria Cantwell
Honorable Patty Murray

United States House of Representatives

Honorable Doc Hastings, District 4
Honorable Rick Larsen, District 2
Honorable Norm Dicks, District 6



Washington State Senate

Honorable Linda Evans Parlette, 12th District
Honorable Mary Margaret Haugen, 10th District
Honorable Val Stevens, 39th District
Harriet Spanel, 40th District
Dale Brandland, 42nd District

House of Representatives

Honorable Barry Sehlin, 10th District
Honorable Barbara Bailey, 10th District
Honorable Cary Condotta, 12th District
Honorable Mike Armstrong, 12th District
Honorable Dan Kristiansen, 39th District
Honorable Kirk Pearson, 39th District
Honorable Dave Quall, 40th District
Honorable Jeff Morris, 40th District
Honorable Doug Ericksen, 42nd District
Honorable Kelli Linville, 42nd District

STATE OF WASHINGTON AGENCIES

Washington Department of Ecology
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
State Historic Preservation Office

WASHINGTON COUNTIES

Mayor, City of Chelan
Mayor, City of Sedro-Woolley
Mayor, City of Mount Vernon
Mayor, City of Wenatchee
Chelan County Commissioners
Skagit County Commissioners
Whatcom County Commissioners

STATE OF OREGON

Oregon State University, Forest Sciences Laboratory



ORGANIZATIONS
AND BUSINESSES

Darrington Pharmacy
Earth Justice Legal Defense Fund
Kettle Range Conservation Group
King County Outdoor Sports Council
National Parks and Conservation Association
North Cascades Conservation Council
Seattle City Light
Sierra Club, Cascades Chapter
Student Conservation Assn. Inc.
The Henry M. Jackson Foundation
The Mountaineers
The Nature Conservancy
The Wilderness Society, Washington Chapter
Trail Blazers, Inc.
Trout Unlimited
University of Washington School of Aquatic Fishery Science
Washington Outfitters & Guide Association
Washington State Hi-Lakers
Washington State Sportsmen's Council
Washington Trout
Washington Wilderness Coalition
Western Land Exchange Project
Wilderness Watch, Montana

MEDIA AND PUBLICATIONS

Bellingham Herald
Skagit Valley Herald
The Herald
The Wenatchee World
SIGNPOST Magazine
Seattle Times-Science/Environmental Reporter

CANADA

British Columbia Ministry of Air, Land, and Water Protection



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHARTER FOR THE MOUNTAIN LAKES FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Mission: To advise and provide recommendations to the managers of the North Cascades National Park Service Complex on matters regarding fisheries data and analysis for a mountain lake fishery management plan and environmental impact statement.

Nature of Involvement: The committee will meet periodically for the duration of this environmental impact statement project to review and supplement necessary background information and data needed for the completion of an environmental impact statement. In addition, the committee will suggest analysis techniques and a range of management options that should be addressed as part of completing a defensible, resource-based planning process. Also, the committee will be asked to review draft documents related to the environmental impact statement process.

Members: Mark Downen (WDFW); Reed Glesne, Ron Holmes, Roy Zipp, Regina Rochefort (North Cascades Complex); Gary Larson (USGS-BRD); Bob Hoffman, Bill Liss (Oregon State University); Rob Nielsen (URS Corporation); Bob Pfeifer (WDFW); John Wullschleger (NPS/WRD); Facilitator; Recorder.

F U N C T I O N S

1. To refine and further define the nature and scope (spatial/temporal) of ecological *issues*.¹
2. To identify and recommend reasonable fishery management actions for park management to consider in developing alternatives for analyses.
3. To provide data to assist the park in describing the *affected environment*¹ for the environmental impact statement.

1. The *italicized* words are part of the standard lexicon of the NEPA process; they are defined in the "Definitions" section below.



4. To assist in developing *impact analysis*¹ methodologies based upon best available science.
5. To review and comment on the analyses of *environmental consequences*¹ of management actions.
6. To provide technical guidance on presentations for public meetings.
7. To review and comment on the draft environmental impact statement and related documents.

DEFINITIONS

Issue – An environmental problem or relationship between a resource and an action. In an environmental impact statement, an issue is defined in the form of an *Issue Statement* that describes the resource(s) that would be affected by an action. Example: Anglers trample lakeshore vegetation.

Affected Environment – Resources expected to experience environmental impacts. The boundary or area for each resource must be delineated; it will vary substantially among resources. Example: riparian vegetation. For this environmental impact statement, the “boundary” for riparian vegetation might include all riparian vegetation around mountain lakes within the park.

Impact Analysis – The formal, objective process of predicting the degree to which a resource will be affected by each alternative. The prediction must include considerations of context, intensity, duration, and timing. Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts must be analyzed.

Environmental Consequences – The direct, indirect, and cumulative consequences (impacts) of alternatives.

