

CHAPTER 5

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

The intent of the *National Environmental Policy Act* is to encourage the participation of federal and state-involved agencies and affected citizens in the assessment procedure, as appropriate. This section describes the consultation that occurred during development of this *Draft White-tailed Deer Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement*, including consultation with scientific experts and other agencies. This chapter also includes a description of the public involvement process and a list of the recipients of the draft document.

HISTORY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The public involvement activities for this *Draft White-tailed Deer Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* fulfill the requirements of the *National Environmental Policy Act* and *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 or public scoping. Internal scoping involved discussions among NPS personnel regarding the purpose of and need for management actions, issues, management alternatives, mitigation measures, the analysis boundary, appropriate level of documentation, available references and guidance, and other related topics.



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 an opportunity to comment and contribute early in the decision-making process. For this planning document and impact statement, 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 to 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 scoping was conducted for this impact statement.

The public scoping process helps ensure that people have an opportunity to comment and contribute early in the decision-making process.

INTERNAL SCOPING

The internal scoping process began on October 28, 2003, at Catoctin Mountain Park, Maryland. During the two-day meeting, NPS employees identified the purpose of and need for action, management objectives, issues, and impact topics. Various roles and responsibilities for developing the deer management plan were also clarified. The results of the meetings were captured in an “Internal Scoping Report” (NPS 2003d), now on file as part of the administrative record.

In addition, the park had coordinated with many technical experts for five years prior to starting the planning process and established a Science Team to provide input to this plan, as described in “[Chapter 1: Purpose of an Need for Action.](#)” Comprised of subject matter experts, the Science Team was chartered to advise and provide technical recommendations to the National Park Service on matters regarding scientific data and analysis. The team met periodically to review and supplement necessary background information and needed data. The team also recommended impact analysis techniques and various management options, and they provided technical review of draft documents. The first of five Science

Team meetings was held on October 13, 2004. (Members of the Science Team are listed with the document preparers in this chapter.)

PUBLIC SCOPING

Public Meetings and Comments

Public scoping efforts for this planning process focused on the means or processes to be used to include the public, the major interest groups, and local public entities. Based on past experience, park staff place a high priority on meeting the intent of public involvement in the NEPA process and giving the public an opportunity to comment on proposed actions.

For deer management at Catoctin Mountain Park two public involvement meetings were held to give the public opportunities to comment. The first meeting was held on November 9, 2004, in Thurmont, Maryland, and was attended by 22 people. The meeting was conducted in an open house format, with display boards illustrating both the project background and preliminary concepts for deer management. A brief presentation was made to the group to provide background information on the NEPA process and the need for this plan. Park personnel were available to answer any questions or concerns and to record comments.

At the first public meeting, the park received a total of 64 comments. While these included some comment letters and the testimony of one person at the public meeting, the majority of these were comments recorded on flip charts at the public meeting. A majority of the comments expressed concern about impacts of the Catoctin deer herd on vegetation or forest regeneration (27 comments) and impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat (29 comments). Others commented on the preliminary alternatives presented and/or proposed new alternatives or alternative elements, which were considered in the development of the final alternatives. In total, one comment supported the no-action alternative, 4 supported the use of fencing and repellents, 7 supported direct reduction, 7 supported hunting, and 14 proposed new alternatives or alternative elements. Some of the alternatives proposed were considered but dismissed for various reasons, as discussed in [chapter 2](#).

The second public meeting was an alternatives development workshop held on April 20, 2005, in Thurmont, Maryland. The purpose of the workshop was to gather public concerns regarding each alternative so that the National Park Service could improve upon them during the planning process. A total of 36 participants attended and were divided into four work groups. Comments were collected for each of the alternatives being considered. Participants could also provide written comments, as well as provide comments through the Internet using the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) website.

Comments and concerns regarding the four alternatives gathered at the alternatives development workshop can be summarized as follows:

- *Alternative A* — This alternative would not meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action to manage the deer population in Catoctin Mountain Park; and it would adversely affect neighboring properties as

the deer population would continue to be overabundant and damage yards, orchards, and farms.

- *Alternative B* — This alternative would be costly and ineffective; fencing would have overall negative effects, keeping visitors and other wildlife out of the park; repellents require multiple applications and would be both costly and labor intensive; and non-lethal actions would drive deer onto neighboring properties, negatively affecting local farmers.
- *Alternative C (Preferred Alternative)* — This alternative would need to focus on the taking of does as a means of population control, and it would pose certain safety risks with the use of rifles in the park.
- *Alternative D* — The non-lethal methods of the alternative would be too costly and ineffective; reproductive controls could pose a human health risk due to the potential contamination of the deer meat and associated human consumption; and lethal actions pose a potential safety risk related to the use of firearms in the park.

Individuals in all groups expressed a concern that the alternative of a public hunt was removed and placed under alternatives considered but not carried forward.

In total 40 letters and e-mails were received in addition to the comments made by the 36 participants during the alternatives development workshop. A total of 24 comments had concerns about the potential implementation of lethal management alternatives. The remaining comments were of a general nature about alternatives, lethal methods, and requests for information on deer repellents, the use of reproductive control, and suggestions for a public hunt or a change in park legislation to allow a managed public hunt.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement was published in the *Federal Register* on June 23, 2004.

A newsletter was mailed in October 2004 to the project's preliminary mailing list of government agencies, organizations, businesses, and individuals. The newsletter announced the public scoping meeting on November 9, 2004, and summarized the purpose of and need for a deer management plan, the plan objectives, and the history of Catoctin's deer research and management.

A second newsletter was sent out in March 2005 to announce the alternatives development workshop on April 20, 2005. This newsletter briefly described the preliminary alternatives and the alternatives considered but not being carried forward, the anticipated project schedule, the purpose of and need for action, and methods to comment on the draft environmental impact statement.

AGENCY CONSULTATION

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

A letter dated May 21, 2004, from Catoctin Mountain Park initiated informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service about the presence of federally listed rare, threatened, or endangered species in the vicinity of the park. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service replied on August 11, 2004, that, except for the occasional transient individuals, no federally proposed or listed endangered or threatened species are known to exist within the project impact area, and that no biological assessment or further consultation under Section 7 of the *Endangered Species Act* would be required.

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

A letter dated May 21, 2004, initiated informal consultation with the Wildlife and Heritage Service of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources about the presence of state listed rare, threatened, or endangered species in the vicinity of the park. The response on July 13, 2004, listed seven such species.

MARYLAND STATE HISTORIC TRUST

Catoctin Mountain Park submitted a review in accordance with Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* to the state Historic Preservation Officer. A copy of the draft environmental impact statement will be sent to the Maryland Historical Trust to complete Section 106 compliance.

LIST OF RECIPIENTS OF THE DRAFT PLAN / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This *Draft White-tailed Deer Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* will be sent to the following agencies, organizations, and businesses, as well as to other entities and individuals who requested a copy.

FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Wildlife Services

Department of the Army

Fort Detrick Outdoor Recreation

Department of the Interior

National Park Service

Antietam National Battlefield

Appalachian National Scenic Trail Project Office

C&O Canal National Historical Park

Gettysburg National Military Park

Harpers Ferry National Historical Park

Historic Preservation Training Center

Mather Training Center

Monocacy National Battlefield

National Park Service, National Capital Region

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Department of the Navy

Naval Support Facility

Environmental Protection Agency

MARYLAND AGENCIES

Cunningham Falls State Park

Maryland Department of Natural Resources Wildlife and Heritage Services

Natural Resource Police

COUNTY AND LOCAL AGENCIES

Chambersburg Public Opinion

Frederick Community College

Frederick Chamber of Commerce

Montgomery County Conservation Center

Smithsburg Town Office
Thurmont Town Office
Tourism Council of Frederick County

MEDIA, ORGANIZATIONS, AND BUSINESSES

Action for Animals Network
Alliance for Animals
Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay
Animal Protection Institute
Antietam Cable Television
Appalachian Trail Arms Collectors, Inc.
Bay Journal
Blue Ridge Outdoors
Call of the Wild Sportsmen, Inc.
CALM, Inc.
Capital Gazette
Carlisle Evening Sun
Carroll County Times
Catocin Fish & Game Protective Association, Inc.
Channel 67, Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting
Cold Deer Hunting and Fishing Club
Discovery Newsletter
Evening Star
Evening Sun
Frederick Chapter of the Izaak Walton League
Frederick County Sportsman's Council
Frederick Gazette
Frederick News Post
Friends of Animals
Friends of Big Hunting Creek
Friends of Frederick County
Fund for Animals
Guardian Hose Fire Company
Hanover Evening Sun
Hanover Times
Harrisburg Patriot – Evening News
Herald Mail

Historical Society of Frederick County
Humane Society of the United States
Kidstreet News
Last Chance for Animals
Loudoun *Times – Mirror*
Marine Security Company
Martinsburg *Journal*
Maryland Native Plant Society
Maryland Ornithological Society
Mayberry Game Protective Association, Inc.
Maryland Farm Bureau
Mt. Airy Chapter of the Izaak Walton League
Mt. Quirauk Rod and Gun Club, Inc.
New Forest Society
North American Rod and Gun Club
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
Potomac Fish and Game Club
Record Herald
Recreation News
Redding Nursery
Showing Animals Respect and Kindness
Sierra Club of Frederick, Carroll, and Washington Counties
Sierra Club, Maryland Chapter
South Mountain Rod and Gun Club
Sunday Sun
The Baltimore Sun
The Banner
The Chronicle
The Daily Record
The Gettysburg Times
The Valley Revue
Thurmont Sportsman Club
Tuscarora Archers, Inc.
U.S. Sportsmen’s Alliance
Washington Magazine
Washington Post

SCIENCE TEAM MEMBERS

Name	Title	Organization / Location
Ms. Michelle Batcheller	Wildlife Biologist	NPS – Northeast Region
Mr. Scott Bates	Regional Wildlife Biologist	NPS – Center for Urban Ecology
Mr. Scott Bell	Environmental Protection Specialist	NPS – Catoctin Mountain Park
Dr. Doug Boucher	Associate Professor of Biology	Hood College, Frederick Maryland
Mr. Brian Eyler	Deer Biologist	Maryland Department of Natural Resources – Wildlife
Dr. Bert Frost	Research Coordinator/ Certified Wildlife Biologist	NPS – Great Basin Cooperative Eco Studies Unit (previously at Gettysburg National Military Park)
Dr. Richard Hammerschlag	USGS Biological Resource Division at Catoctin Research Center	USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center
Ms. Beth Kunkel	Team Facilitator	URS Corporation
Mr. Randy Knutson	Wildlife Biologist	NPS – Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore
Dr. William McShea	Wildlife Biologist	National Zoo Conservation and Research Center
Dr. Diane Pavek	Botanist-Research Coordinator	NPS – Center for Urban Ecology
Mr. Dan Sealy	Deputy Chief, Natural Resource and Science, National Capital Region	NPS – Center for Urban Ecology
Dr. James Sherald	Natural Resources Chief, NPS National Capital Region	NPS – Center for Urban Ecology
Dr. Susan Stout	Silviculturalist	USDA – Forest Service
Ms. Donna Swauger	Environmental Protection Specialist	NPS – Catoctin Mountain Park
Dr. Brian Underwood	Wildlife Biologist	USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Syracuse, NY
Mr. Jim Voigt	Resource Manager	NPS – Catoctin Mountain Park
Dr. Robert Warren	Professor of Wildlife Management	University of Georgia

LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONSULTANTS

Name	Title	Education/Responsibility	Experience
National Park Service			
Jim Voigt	Resource Manager, Catoctin Mountain Park	M.S. in Park Management. Provided input and review.	29 years
P. Scott Bell	Environmental Protection Specialist, Catoctin Mountain Park	B.A. in Biology, M.S. in Parks and Recreation Resources. Project Coordinator.	17 years parks management; 10 years compliance regulation
Donna Swauger	Environmental Protection Specialist, Catoctin Mountain Park	B.S. in Environmental Sciences. Project Coordinator.	15 years
J. Mel Poole	Superintendent, Catoctin Mountain Park	B.S. Horticulture. Manages Catoctin Mountain Park.	28 years
Rebecca Loncosky	Park Ranger with law enforcement and natural and cultural resource management responsibilities.	A.S. in Wildlife Technology. Provided technical input.	16 years
Scott Bates	Regional Wildlife Biologist NPS — Center for Urban Ecology	B.S. Biology; M.S. Wildlife Management. Provided technical input.	7 years with NPS NCR and 9 years with DoD as a wildlife biologist
Diane Pavek	Research Coordinator	B.S. in Botany and Zoology; M.S., Ph.D. in Botany. Provided technical input.	25 years in botany; 8 years with NPS
Sandy Hamilton	Environmental Protection Specialist (EQD)	M.S. Ecology, University of Minnesota. J.D. Law, University of Denver; LLM Environmental and Natural Resources Law and Policy, University of Denver. Provided input and review.	18 years
Michael Mayer	Environmental Protection Specialist (EQD)	B.S. Wildlife and Fisheries Biology; M.S. Wildlife Conservation; J.D. Environmental Law. Responsible for NEPA policy, guidance, and technical review. Project manager, technical reviewer.	10 years
URS Corporation			
Beth Kunkel	Wildlife Biologist and Environmental Planner	B.S. Wildlife Management. Responsible for facilitation of Science Team meetings, developed action thresholds, prepared vegetation and wildlife sections, and existing conditions for white-tailed deer.	18 years

Name	Title	Education/Responsibility	Experience
Rusty Schmidt	Landscape Ecologist	B.S. Biology, Art, and Chemistry. Responsible for data collection and coordination to support Science Team, development of action thresholds and alternatives, assisted with preparation of existing condition sections for vegetation, wildlife, and deer.	5 years
Greg Sorensen	Technical Editor	B.A. International Affairs. Responsible for technical editing document.	30 years
Patti Steinholtz	Writer/Editor, NEPA Planner	B.A. Communications and English. Responsible for portions of chapters 1, 2, 5, and safety, visitor use and experience topics.	9 years
The Louis Berger Group, Inc.			
Shannon Cauley, CWD	Senior Scientist	B.S. Geology. Responsible for sensitive and rare species.	22 years
Stuart Dixon	Senior Architectural Historian	B.A. History; M.A. U.S. History, Responsible for cultural resources section.	13 years
Joel Gorder, AICP	Planner	B.S. Limnology, Biology, M.S., Urban and Regional Planning; Responsible for park management and operations section.	8 years
Lori Gutman, AICP	Senior Planner	B.S. Natural Resources and Environmental Policy; M.C.P., Land Use, Environmental and Economic Development Planning. Responsible for park management and operations section.	5 years
Karen Lusby	Senior Planner	B.A. Outdoor Recreation and Park Administration; M.S. Forest Economics. Responsible for socioeconomic and portions of cultural resource sections.	22 years
Dana Otto, AICP	Senior Environmental Scientist	B.S. Biological Sciences; M.S. Environmental Planning. Responsible for project management and review of all sections prepared by Louis Berger staff.	12 years
Spence Smith	Scientist	B.S. Zoology; M.A., Biology-Marine Biology Concentration. Responsible for soils and water quality.	9 years
Nancy Van Dyke	Senior Consultant	B.A. Biology and Geography; M.S. Environmental Sciences. Responsible for project management and senior technical review of all sections.	26 years

Name	Title	Education/Responsibility	Experience
R E D , I n c . C o m m u n i c a t i o n s			
Tracy Stemple	Technical Writer	B.S. English. Responsible for text pull-outs and captions.	16 years
Stephannie Lambert	Graphic Designer	Responsible for cover design, map design and high-resolution photographs.	10 years
Cheryl Priest	Desktop Publisher / Text Processor	Responsible for layout design and formatting.	14 years