

REVISED DISCUSSION DRAFT
ESTIMATED TIMELINE GGNRA NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING/NEPA PROCESSES
August 15, 2006

Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) Advisory Committee Process	NEPA Process
<p><u>July 31:</u></p> <p>NR Committee Meeting #4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review data needs recommendation from Technical Subcommittee Meeting #1 ○ decide next steps ○ Review initial Key Interests and Issues Table ○ NEPA IDT Data Needs/Questions for Committee Members 	<p><u>End of July</u></p> <p>NEPA IDT comments on No Action Alternative, impact thresholds, and draft Affected Environment consolidated and to NEPA contractor.</p>
<p><u>Mid-August 2006</u></p> <p>Committee provides feedback on current conditions to NEPA contractor</p> <p>Site Visits for committee members at specified Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo.</p>	<p><u>August 2006</u></p> <p>August 1: NEPA Agency Scoping and informal meeting with USFWS.</p> <p>NEPA IDT initiates informal consultation with USFWS.</p> <p>EQD/TQNEPA prepares preliminary draft Criteria for park review.</p>
<p><u>September 2006</u></p> <p>Site Visits for committee members at specified Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo.</p> <p>Technical Subcommittee Meeting #2 (2nd wk Sept):</p>	<p><u>September 2006</u></p> <p>NEPA IDT: Review <u>preliminary draft Criteria</u>. (Proposed conference call) Develop draft systematic approach for risk factors criteria and begin research on desired future conditions.</p>

REVISED DISCUSSION DRAFT
ESTIMATED TIMELINE GGNRA NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING/NEPA PROCESSES
August 15, 2006

Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) Advisory Committee Process	NEPA Process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Presentation of NEPA data for areas open to discussion for on-leash or no dogwalking ○ review data needs ○ NEPA team response to data needs from Tech. subcommittee meeting #1 ○ initial presentation of definitions/explanations requested by committee ○ EQD proposal for Joint Fact Finding. <p>Option: Develop initial options for GGNRA-wide issues such as criteria for voice control, commercial dogwalking.</p>	<p>Consolidate results of NEPA no-action questions for committee. NEPA CONTRACTOR: <u>Final No Action Alternative and Affected Environment</u> prepared</p> <p><u>Impact Thresholds</u> revised. Analysis of No Action Alternative begins.</p> <p>End of September: <u>Draft Impacts of No Action Alternative</u> prepared</p>
<p><u>September 21, 2006</u></p> <p>NR Committee Meeting #5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discuss outcomes of Technical Subcommittee Meeting #2; ○ NEPA presentation of summary of public scoping comments (full report to be available electronically) ○ Review revisions to Key Interests and Issues Table ○ Presentation by DOI staff of rulemaking process ○ NEPA presentation of preliminary criteria/risk factors for development of alternatives to the NR committee ○ Agree on next steps. 	<p><u>September 21, 2006</u></p> <p><u>Final draft criteria</u> prepared and presented to committee. Results of public scoping presented to committee.</p>

REVISED DISCUSSION DRAFT
ESTIMATED TIMELINE GGNRA NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING/NEPA PROCESSES
August 15, 2006

Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) Advisory Committee Process	NEPA Process
	<p><u>Early October 2006</u></p> <p>Review <u>Impacts of No Action</u>. Park consolidates comments for contractor prior to IDT meeting.</p>
<p><u>Mid-October 2006</u></p> <p>Technical Subcommittee Meeting #3 in day-long workshop format - specific agenda to be determined. Suggested agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o focus on GGNRA area-specific dog management options o discuss area-specific issues and consider draft consensus language (need large scale, detailed unit maps) o continued clarification of definitions/explanations requested by committee 	<p><u>Mid-October 2006</u></p> <p>NEPA IDT: Proposed meeting to develop draft <u>desired future conditions</u> and <u>Preliminary Alternatives</u> (proposed NEPA IDT meeting)</p>
<p><u>Early-Mid November 2006</u></p> <p>NR Committee Meeting #6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Review draft area-specific options o discuss integration of GGNRA-wide and area-specific options, and options/agreements discussed. <p>Option: NEPA can present draft <u>desired future conditions</u> (includes criteria for restoration) and <u>Preliminary Alternatives</u> to Committee</p>	<p><u>November 2006</u></p> <p>NEPA can present draft <u>desired future conditions</u> (including criteria for restoration) and <u>Preliminary Range of Alternatives</u> to Committee</p> <p>NEPA IDT presents <u>range of preliminary alternatives</u> to be analyzed in the EIS to region/WASO for concurrence or should preliminary alternatives first go out for public comment and brief PWR in January?</p> <p><u>Newsletter</u> prepared to obtain public comment on alternatives. (Optional)</p>

REVISED DISCUSSION DRAFT
ESTIMATED TIMELINE GGNRA NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING/NEPA PROCESSES
August 15, 2006

Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) Advisory Committee Process	NEPA Process
<p><u>January 2007</u></p> <p>NR Committee Meeting #7: Consider draft consensus options for areas of agreement and options for addressing topics/areas where consensus has not yet been reached.</p> <p>Note: It may be advantageous for the NR Committee to hold off finalizing consensus until NEPA analysis is complete on the actions proposed in the rule.</p>	<p><u>January 2007</u></p> <p>NEPA IDT presents final draft <u>range of reasonable alternatives</u> to NR committee and continues to complete its impact analysis on those alternatives.</p> <p>Note: A biological assessment must also be prepared on the “proposed draft rule/NEPA preferred alternative”. NEPA contractor prepares BA for park.</p>
<p><u>February-May 2007</u></p> <p><u>February – March 2007</u> – Meetings of Outreach/Educational and Implementation subcommittees to initiate discussion of operational/implementation needs.</p> <p><u>April 2007</u> – <u>Technical Subcommittee meeting #4</u> to review draft impact findings on consensus agreement.</p> <p><u>May 2007</u> – <u>NR Committee Meeting #8</u> – meets if adjustments needed to consensus agreement based on work Technical Subcommittee meeting #4</p>	<p><u>April 2007</u></p> <p>Preliminary <u>impact analysis</u> complete for range of alternatives. NEPA IDT reviews findings and provides comments to contractor.</p>
<p><u>May-September 2007</u></p> <p>Draft Rule Package prepared for DOI, SOL and OMB review (this includes OMB’s requirements for economic analysis, which will be prepared by NEPA contractor). This time period includes a</p>	<p><u>May 2007</u></p> <p>Contractor revises <u>impact analysis</u> and NEPA IDT meets to select <u>preferred alternative</u> using a method such as “Choosing by Advantage”, or Delphi Process (systematic approach to measure how well each</p>

REVISED DISCUSSION DRAFT
ESTIMATED TIMELINE GGNRA NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING/NEPA PROCESSES
August 15, 2006

Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) Advisory Committee Process	NEPA Process
<p>series of internal reviews and revisions as needed to meet regulatory rulemaking requirements.</p> <p><u>September 2007</u> – <u>NR Committee Meeting #9</u> – to complete feedback loop and review rulemaking language</p>	<p>alternative meets objectives).</p> <p>Contractor begins to prepare preliminary <u>draft Biological Assessment</u> on preferred alternative.</p>
	<p><u>June-August 2007</u> Contractor prepares <u>internal draft EIS</u> for NPS review and comment.</p> <p>Consultation with USFWS continues as Draft Biological Assessment is completed by NEPA contractor.</p>
<p><u>September – November 2007</u></p> <p>This is the time the NEPA IDT/contractor will be producing the DEIS for public comment. Major changes to draft rule by DOI, SOL or OMB would affect NEPA timeline if further analysis is required. OMB review can take a minimum of 90 days.</p>	<p><u>September – November 2007</u></p> <p>Contractor prepares <u>DEIS</u> for public review. (This time period includes a series of internal reviews and document revisions)</p> <p>When DEIS is released for public review, <u>Biological Assessment is submitted to USFWS</u> requesting, if needed, their Biological Opinion. (USFWS review can take up to 90 days)</p>
<p><u>January 2008</u></p> <p>Draft rule published in Federal Register for public comment (usually 60 day public comment period)</p>	<p><u>January – March 2008</u></p> <p><u>Dog Management Plan/DEIS</u> released for public review (60 day comment period); public meetings.</p>
<p><u>Late Spring 2008</u></p> <p>Begin preparation of final rule based upon public comment analysis (from comments received on the EIS and proposed rule—</p>	<p><u>Late Spring 2008</u></p> <p>Review public comments on DEIS and proposed draft rule. Modify preferred alternative if needed to respond to public and agencies’</p>

REVISED DISCUSSION DRAFT
ESTIMATED TIMELINE GGNRA NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING/NEPA PROCESSES
August 15, 2006

Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) Advisory Committee Process	NEPA Process
<p>these tend to be overlapping). Option here may be to re-engage the NR committee to help resolve issues brought up during comment periods. (NOTE: committee charter expires in February 2008)</p>	<p>comments.</p>
<p><u>Mid – Late 2008</u></p> <p>Final rule prepared for review. OMB will normally not review final rules without the NEPA decision document being signed (in this case the ROD). Final rule would also need to reflect any changes in NEPA preferred alternative and vice versa.</p> <p>Final rule published in Federal Register. Implementation begins 30 days after publication.</p>	<p><u>Mid – Late 2008</u></p> <p><u>Final EIS</u> prepared, including responses to public comments. This includes a series of internal reviews and contractor revisions, approvals by regional director, development of Record of Decision, etc.</p> <p>ROD approved by Regional Director 30 days after FEIS made available to public.</p>