

Department of the Interior
FY 2014 Report on Environmental Collaboration
and Conflict Resolution (ECCR)¹
Policy Report to OMB-CEQ

ECCR is defined in Section 2 of the 2012 memorandum as:

“ . . . third-party assisted collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution in the context of environmental, public lands, or natural resources issues or conflicts, including matters related to energy, transportation, and water and land management.

The term Environmental Collaboration and Conflict Resolution encompasses a range of assisted collaboration, negotiation, and facilitated dialogue processes and applications. These processes directly engage affected interests and Federal department and agency decision makers in collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution.

Multi-issue, multi-party environmental disputes or controversies often take place in high conflict and low trust settings, where the assistance of impartial facilitators or mediators can be instrumental to reaching agreement and resolution. Such disputes range broadly from policy and regulatory disputes to administrative adjudicatory disputes, civil judicial disputes, intra- and interagency disputes, and disputes with non-Federal persons and entities.

Environmental Collaboration and Conflict Resolution can be applied during policy development or planning in the context of a rulemaking, administrative decision making, enforcement, or litigation with appropriate attention to the particular requirements of those processes. These contexts typically involve situations where a Federal department or agency has ultimate responsibility for decision making and there may be disagreement or conflict among Federal, Tribal, State and local governments and agencies, public interest organizations, citizens groups, and business and industry groups.

Although Environmental Collaboration and Conflict Resolution refers specifically to collaborative and conflict resolution processes aided by third-party neutrals, there is a broad array of partnerships, cooperative arrangements, and unassisted negotiations that Federal agencies may pursue with non-Federal entities to plan, manage, and implement department and agency programs and activities. The Basic Principles for Agency Engagement in Environmental Conflict Resolution and Collaborative Problem Solving are presented in Attachment B. The Basic Principles provide guidance that applies to both Environmental Collaboration and Conflict Resolution and unassisted collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution. This policy recognizes the importance and value of the appropriate use of all forms collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution.”

¹ The term ‘ECCR’ includes third-party neutral assistance in environmental collaboration and environmental conflict resolution

FY 2014 ECCR Report

Name of Department/Agency responding:	Department of the Interior
Name and Title/Position of person responding:	Matt Costello, Acting Director,
Division/Office of person responding:	Office of Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution under the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Technology, Information, and Business Systems (TIBs), PMB
Contact information (phone/email):	Mathew_Costello@ios.doi.gov
Date this report is being submitted:	March 6, 2015
Name of ECCR Forum Representative:	Robert Fisher

1. **ECCR Capacity Building Progress:** Describe steps taken by your department or agency to build programmatic and institutional capacity for environmental collaboration and conflict resolution in FY 2014, including progress made since FY 2013. Include any efforts to establish routine procedures for considering ECCR in specific situations or categories of cases. To the extent your organization wishes to report on any efforts to provide institutional support for non-assisted collaboration efforts include it here. If no steps were taken, please indicate why not.

[Please refer to the mechanisms and strategies presented in Section 5 and attachment C of the OMB-CEQ ECCR Policy Memo, including but not restricted to any efforts to a) integrate ECCR objectives into agency mission statements, Government Performance and Results Act goals, and strategic planning; b) assure that your agency's infrastructure supports ECCR; c) invest in support, programs, or trainings; and d) focus on accountable performance and achievement. You are encouraged to attach policy statements, plans and other relevant documents.]

The Department of the Interior (DOI) continues to build institutional and programmatic capacity to encourage the broadest possible appropriate and effective use of ECCR and collaborative problem-solving processes to address environmental conflict. The infrastructure established in DOI to carry out the directives in the OBM/CEQ Memorandum on ECCR include the Office of Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution (CADR) in the Office of the Secretary, the Senior Counsel for CADR in the Office of the Solicitor, and the Interior Dispute Resolution Council (IDRC) comprised of Bureau Dispute Resolution Specialists (BDRS).

The CADR office and Senior Counsel for CADR coordinate with partners both within and outside DOI to advance a wide variety of capacity-building strategies. The IDRC is comprised of designated BDRS's from each bureau. It is the leadership team for ensuring a coordinated effort to integrate effective conflict management practices and collaborative problem solving as routine business practices throughout DOI. CADR, SOL, and the IDRC are guided by a shared mission and a jointly developed strategic plan that includes capacity building as one of its primary goals.

These organizational structures were strengthened and additional resources were gathered to support this work during FY 2014. CADR, Senior Counsel for CADR and the IDRC focused on working together and engaging partners throughout DOI's bureaus and offices to build organizational capacity so that DOI's employees are able to:

1. recognize and manage conflict early,
2. identify opportunities and access resources and assistance to engage interested stakeholders in non-adversarial problem-solving processes to produce durable policies, decisions and solutions, and
3. utilize conflict resolution tools whenever possible to achieve goals without unnecessary delays and costs.

Taken together, this leadership team included in FY 2014: 8 FTEs in OS, 1 FTE in SOL, 2 FTEs in the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), 2 FTEs in the Bureau of Indian Affairs / Bureau of Indian Education / Office of the Assistant Secretary – Indian Affairs, 2 FTEs in the US Geological Survey (USGS), and recognized collateral duty Bureau Dispute Resolution Specialists that carry out CADR responsibilities in each of the other DOI bureaus, including the Office of Surface Mining (OSM), the National Park Service (NPS), the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), and the Bureaus of Indian Affairs and Indian Education (BIA and BIE). The Bureau Dispute Resolution Specialists in each bureau are actively engaged in these joint efforts and participate in monthly meetings of the IDRC. They routinely coordinate with each other and with CADR. They also provide ECCR leadership within their respective organizations and are building networks of collaboration champions

throughout their organizations both in DC and in their regional, state and field offices. Examples of coordinated capacity-building efforts during FY 2014 included:

1. Providing consultation services to individuals, offices, teams, and bureaus on all issues relating to ECCR including education and support for DOI managers on when and how to work with a professional facilitator and education and support for external dispute resolution professionals about DOI and bureau organizational structures, culture, and coordination needs;
2. Working closely with the BLM on development and implementation of the BLM's Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution Strategic Plan (see below);
3. Continued implementation of an integrated communication strategy to build a common vision, messages and language about conflict management and collaborative problem-solving to increase understanding of how these processes and tools can improve results in resolving issues and help advance program goals and mission;
4. Conducting briefings and meetings with senior leadership on ECCR and collaborative problem-solving to build understanding, increase awareness, seek input on opportunities and challenges, identify resources and build leadership support in all bureaus, offices and program areas;
5. A more coordinated approach between the CADR team in OS, SOL, and the Bureaus, in partnership with DOI and Bureau training centers to provide high quality, relevant leadership education and training as well as basic public participation, collaboration, conflict management, ECCR and negotiation skills training for managers and employees throughout DOI;
6. Assisting parties within and outside DOI in identifying and timely acquiring the services of skilled facilitators and mediators acceptable to all parties to conduct assessments, assist with process design and facilitate ECCR processes;
7. Establishing and building an internal facilitation roster; and
8. Evaluating significant ECCR processes and sharing information on projects, cross cutting initiatives, case studies and lessons learned.

Additionally, CADR, SOL and the IDRC shared information and coordinated efforts with many partners to advance the capacity-building goals of the OMB/CEQ Memorandum and coordinated on inter-related efforts and initiatives including, amongst others:

- The DOI Human Capital team, Bureau Human Capital Officers and Human Resource Directors on issues such as collaboration and conflict management competency; workforce development; knowledge management; training; strategic employee development; and supervisory training;
- The CADR Office established and manages an IDIQ contract as a

strategic sourcing initiative for all DOI bureaus and offices to expeditiously procure the services of conflict management professionals to help manage and resolve environmental conflict;

- The Solicitor's Office Division of General Law on general legal guidance and questions raised about collaboration and ECCR processes such as FACA, FOIA, administrative law or confidentiality issues, or on specific processes or negotiation challenges;
- CADR continues to lead implementation of DOI's Open Government plan in FY 2014, to improve openness, transparency, collaboration and participation in all program areas throughout DOI. DOI published Version 3.0 of its Open Government Plan in June 2014. Among other things, this collaborative initiative has resulted in the publication of 23,000 data sets to data.gov and 79,000 data sets to data.doi.gov, and the continued work of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) including the March 2014 admittance of the United States as an EITI Candidate Country, the first G8 nation to attain such status;
- The early development of the MyAmerica initiative which is envisioned as a data and web services platform that will make key visitor and travel information for public lands available in standard formats via easy to use Application Programming Interfaces (APIs);
- The Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance (OEPC) on NEPA collaboration and adaptive management; and
- The FWS to support the development of the National Landscape Conservation Council.

The CADR office Director and staff members and Senior Counsel for CADR also continued to represent DOI on several interagency groups and participated in a variety of interagency efforts to build common understanding and jointly advance collaboration and ECCR processes amongst agencies. Examples include the ECCR Forum led by OMB/CEQ, the ABA Federal Working Group on Collaboration and Dispute Resolution, and the Interagency ADR Working Group.

Training remains the cornerstone of DOI's effort to build capacity for effective conflict management and collaborative problem solving. DOI is committed to building conflict management skills and collaboration competency to improve internal and external communication, stakeholder engagement in planning and decision-making, collaborative problem-solving and conflict resolution in all areas of the Department's work. In short, we believe that good conflict management in the workplace will lead to good conflict management with external parties and issues.

For example, CADR also partners with NPS to provide Collaboration Clinics to assist NPS staff, stakeholders, and partners develop the specialized skills to work collaboratively for more effective planning, decision-making and resource management. Collaboration Clinic trainers work with parks and other clinic sites

to increase the in-house collaborative capacity tailored to a park's particular needs or situation. Clinic content combines elements of many different disciplines including communication, conflict resolution, consensus building, designing collaborative processes, facilitation, mediation, group dynamics, neuroscience, planning, interest-based negotiation, public participation, having difficult conversations, organizational development and more. Four Collaboration Clinics were held in 2014.

During FY 2014, CADR-certified trainers delivered 80 conflict management skills training sessions to over 2,762 employees from all bureaus and offices in a variety of locations throughout the U.S. The foundational course "Getting to the CORE of Conflict" was designed to improve performance in the following key areas: Recognizing conflict and its root causes; Strategically responding to conflict; Efficiently managing and resolving conflict; Convening conflict management processes; Interest-Based Negotiations; and Identifying conflict as an opportunity to create change and build relationships.

CADR developed and tested this curriculum in 2006-2007 and has used a train the trainer approach to steadily increase DOI's capacity to deliver consistent conflict management training for DOI employees in all bureaus and offices in locations throughout the U.S. at the lowest possible cost and with the additional benefit of using the trainers to build a community of practice and champions from all functional areas and all parts of DOI. Evaluations show that the overwhelming majority of participants considered this training as highly relevant to their work, and an aid in enabling them to accomplish their work more efficiently and effectively. In FY 2010, in response to demand and a clear need, CADR added a module to the training entitled "Getting to the CORE of Communications." In FY 2014, CADR developed a course combining components of "Getting to the CORE of Conflict and Communications." In addition, CADR developed and offered another communications-related training on the difficulties in intergenerational communication entitled "Getting to the CORE of Generational Differences in the Workplace." These modules continue to be offered to DOI managers and employees and continue to receive overwhelmingly positive evaluations. For example, GTCC is integrated into the One DOI Supervisory training for new DOI managers to provide an introduction to collaboration and conflict management skills.

In addition, each year CADR sponsors training sessions on a variety of conflict management topics. In FY 2014, these offerings covered such topics as Basic Facilitation skills, Communication skills, Conflict Management for Managing by Network, Decision Downloading, Phone Facilitation, Environmental Collaboration and Conflict Resolution, and others.

DOI bureaus and offices are also fully engaged in capacity-building efforts and reported engaging in 99 ECCR cases in FY 2014. DOI bureaus and offices continue to improve their capacity to track and record ECCR activity and their

coordination through the ECCR leadership team in CADR and the Bureaus to complete DOI's annual ECCR reports. While there is still room for improvement in the Department's use of ECCR and collaborative problem-solving, the sustained use of ECCR processes over the past 5 years shows that agencies are seeking to manage conflicts before they reach a formal administrative or judicial adjudicative forum. These are indicators that DOI's capacity building efforts are having a positive impact.

The bureau reports reflect that about 53 percent of ECCR cases took place in the context of planning. This percentage is consistent with previous ECCR reports and reflects that there are significant opportunities to use ECCR in this important aspect of DOI's work, particularly amongst those bureaus with land management responsibilities such as BLM, FWS, and NPS.

The increased use of collaborative approaches to managing conflict and engaging stakeholders at the early phases of processes helps DOI bureaus, offices and program managers reduce the delays, costs, contentiousness, and other adverse consequences associated with the escalation of conflicts into disputes and formal complaints, while also producing better outcomes than administrative or judicially-imposed decisions might produce. When used effectively in the early phases of conflict situations, ECCR allows managers to focus more resources and energy on mission and program needs free from the distractions and demands associated with unresolved conflicts, complaints or litigation.

Examples of specific bureau and office capacity building efforts include:

Bureau of Indian Affairs/ Bureau of Indian Education/ Assistant Secretary – Indian Affairs:

The Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education have taken the following steps in 2014 to build capacity for the ECR process.

The Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action (RACA) currently has one employee working on collaborative problem solving; and one employee on detail from the Office of the Solicitor to engage in mediations and conflict management. The RACA office has provided 9 training sessions with attendance of 58 employees on conflict management and working in the collaborative process. The RACA office regularly engages with the DOI Office of Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution (CADR) office on giving advice to parties who have matters on appeal before the Board of Indian Appeals, looking for creative ways to provide neutral services in cases that present unique circumstances. In addition, Indian Affairs and the Office of the Special Trustee partnered with CADR and the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution on the Secretary of the Interior's Indian Trust Commission.

Bureau of Land Management:

The Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Collaboration and Dispute Resolution Program is structurally located within the Washington Office Resources and Planning Directorate; Division of Decision Support, Planning, and NEPA. Established in 1997, the Collaboration and Dispute Resolution Program is dedicated to policy development, and providing training, resources and direct support for collaborative and dispute resolution processes in the context of natural resources and land management.

The BLM continued to build capacity for Environmental Collaboration and Conflict Resolution (ECCR), including both third-party assisted and unassisted activities, in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 in three primary categories:

Strategic Direction

In FY2014, the BLM partnered with the USGS Branch of Policy Analysis and Science Assistance to conduct a qualitative assessment, including interviews of 22 mid-level managers and decision-makers, to understand the use of, barriers to, and advice on collaborative action and dispute resolution across the BLM. This effort followed the FY 2013 broad quantitative needs assessment also conducted by USGS.

The 2013 quantitative and 2014 quantitative analyses have been completed and the reports will be peer-reviewed and published through the USGS OpenFile system in FY 2015. The BLM has developed a responsive Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution Strategic Plan due for publication in 2015. Broad engagement from BLM leadership resulted in awareness of the situational and organizational barriers that exist to collaborative. The four strategic directions (goals) include:

GOAL 1: Champion a Collaborative Culture. Institutionalize and support effective collaboration and dispute resolution throughout the organization.

GOAL 2: Create a Common Understanding. Use broad outreach with consistent and targeted messaging to build awareness and understanding of collaboration and dispute resolution.

GOAL 3: Build Collaborative Capacity. Develop the skills necessary to effectively implement collaborative action at all organizational levels.

GOAL 4: Demonstrate and Assess Outcomes. Demonstrate accountability and ensure program effectiveness.

The BLM is finalizing the BLM CADR Strategic Plan and organizing initial implementation actions.

Issue Coordination & Program Integration

The BLM coordinates issues and integrates programs across the agency, promoting ECCR in the implementation of existing national policies. In particular, the BLM's National Riparian Service Team (NRST) and the National Operations Center, Division of Resource Services (NOC DRS), continue to expand on and provide high-level technical expertise and program support to BLM and its stakeholders in upholding the overall mission of sustaining the health, diversity and productivity of the public lands.

A significant amount of ECCR work undertaken by the BLM is through unassisted collaboration, which involves utilizing partnerships, cooperative agreements and negotiations with other agencies, stakeholders, the public and tribal groups. The following are examples of ECCR, both unassisted as well as third-party, across a variety of BLM programs, which have become the agency standard for doing business.

Air Quality

The Department of Interior (DOI), BLM, the Department of Agriculture, and the Environmental Protection Agency have taken an interagency approach to address air quality issues associated with on-shore oil and gas development on public lands. A 2011 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) established a common process for those agencies to follow in analyzing the potential air quality impacts of proposed oil and gas activities on public lands. This collaborative approach has increased efficiency and transparency in the process, which benefits industry, other states, Indian tribes, as well as the public.

Eco-regional Assessments

BLM State and Field Offices continue to use a collaborative process for developing Eco-regional Assessments, with particular emphasis on sage grouse habitat. Data is compiled and assessed for natural resource and conservation planning as part of the BLM's landscape approach to land management. This approach studies large geographic areas to identify important ecological values and patterns of environmental changes. Such an approach allows for management strategies to be developed in collaborations with various partners and stakeholders.

Grazing/Rangeland Program

BLM Utah utilized the CADR Program for two initiatives during FY 2014, including use of a third party facilitator to support public and cooperating agency engagement efforts for the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument's (GSENM) Livestock Grazing Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement. Within the grazing program consultation, cooperation and coordination is utilized at numerous junctures in the approval and issuance of livestock grazing permits.

Habitat/Wildlife

Two formal approaches currently in place in the BLM include Sage-grouse Local Working Groups (LWGs) and a Governor's Bighorn Sheep Working Group, both in place in Idaho. Each of these ECCR related formats focuses on development and implementation of best management practices. In the case of the Sage-grouse LWG, a primary function is a collaborative effort to design, fund, and implement habitat conservation projects.

Hazardous Materials Management/Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration

One of many challenging issues for the BLM is compliance with environmental laws and regulations, such as in the Hazardous Materials Management and Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration (NRDAR) Programs. The NRDAR process is a resource management tool the BLM uses to restore injured public resources lost due to contamination caused by the release of hazardous substances. Public participation and other agency cooperation are critical in investigating, analyzing and developing restoration plans for implementation. Open houses and public meetings are held often in order to provide the stakeholders with a vehicle for participation during the cleanup process.

Interagency Strategies

Interagency initiatives included the use of a third party facilitator to support BLM Utah and the National Park Service to reach consensus on a mutually-agreeable approach to develop the interagency Old Spanish National Historic Trail Comprehensive Management Plan.

Land Use Planning/NEPA

Both the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and NEPA contain references to public involvement relevant to BLM's Land Use Planning Program. Nationwide throughout FY 2014, BLM held open houses, workshops, public scoping meetings and numerous other public gatherings as part of its Land Use Planning and NEPA processes. Efforts related to ECCR in land use planning are primarily "proactive" steps taken with the public, interest groups, stakeholders, tribes, local governments, and other agencies to prevent and/or minimize any conflict prior to it becoming a major issue. The BLM continued to engage in unassisted collaborative activities as appropriate in its Land Use Planning and NEPA process, during response to project proposals, NEPA analysis, decision making and permit issuance.

Natural Resource Management

A collaborative resource management specialist and Hatfield Fellow from Portland State University acted as the key contact in the BLM Nevada State Office, developing and implementing a large-scale effort for the Stakeholder Engagement for Healthy Lands Situation Assessment in conjunction with the National Riparian Service Team (NRST). The goal of this process is to

understand and more efficiently navigate the complex natural resource management issues within Nevada, which could be used as a model for other offices. Simultaneously, the BLM initiated an internal Drought Management process to assist BLM managers to design define policies to support good management actions on the ground. Together, these two processes will help Nevada land managers (federal employees and private) accurately define the historical and current state of the rangeland, and provide a forum for visioning for the future and creating management actions to achieve that vision.

Oil and Gas

The BLM is responsible for management of oil and gas leasing, environmental protection and production oversight on public and Indian Trust (on-shore) lands. This oversight function includes proper production, storage, measurement and reporting of oil and gas volumes. The BLM works collaboratively with the DOI Offices of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR), Indian Tribes, the Office of Inspector General and industry to ensure that all process and procedures are carried out in an accurate and timely manner. In addition, there has been increased communication and coordination with state agencies regarding non-compliance issues.

Regional Team Assessments

BLM initiated the Pacific Northwest Regional Infrastructure Team (PNWRIT) in response to the President's announcement in February 2012 of the importance of creating "regional teams" to develop a more effective forum for infrastructure project review, and Executive Order 13604 in March 2012, implementing a government-wide initiative to modernize federal permitting and review processes to achieve better projects, improved environmental and community outcomes, and shorter decision-making timelines for infrastructure improvement projects. PNWRIT is a three year federal-state partnership commitment in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho creating an inter-agency forum where federal and state governments can advance common infrastructure initiatives and goals in the region. A Declaration of Cooperation between the parties in September of 2013 established three priorities: (1) identify regionally significant projects (2) identify broad process improvements (3) identify effective mitigation strategies and opportunities across the region. BLM plans, coordinates and conducts quarterly PNWRIT Steering committee meetings that are attended by a formed steering committee made up of seven federal and state key members (two BLM state directors). Technical oversight is provided by BLM for a Cooperative Agreement between the Western Governors' Association (WGA) and the PNWRIT Steering Committee, which will facilitate improved coordination, development, and dissemination of information pertaining to the transmission siting process. PNWRIT also will leverage and support the efforts underway by the WGA Transmission Siting Task Force and Wildlife Council by offering the opportunity to "field test" WGA's tools, best practices, and mitigation strategies on the PNWRIT's priority projects (including the Vantage to Pomona Heights and Boardman to Hemingway transmission line projects). The Cooperative

Agreement also provides administrative and technical support to the PNWRIT effort through WGA's third party contractor Tetra Tech.

Renewable Energy

As the BLM increases its' efforts to utilize renewable energy resources, the DRS/NOC in coordination with the WO, State and Field Offices continues to work with local communities, state regulators, industry and other federal agencies to ensure a clean energy future. This is accomplished through environmentally sound development of renewable energy on public lands. Throughout FY14, public meetings and stakeholder working groups were utilized to help collaboratively plan and implement renewable energy projects on public lands; included were geothermal, wind and solar projects.

Tribal Consultation

The BLM staff participated in several collaborative efforts that included cooperating agency participations, resource advisory councils, and meetings with partners. One collaborative effort includes the BLM Montana and Dakotas State Offices participation in a Missouri River Basin Interagency Roundtable, which discussed tribal consultation on permitting, especially for rights-of-ways.

Wild Horse and Burro

As a first step in increasing collaborative engagement on wild horse and burro issues, as recommended by the National Academy of Sciences report, *Using Science to Improve the Wild Horse and Burro Program*, preliminary work has begun between BLM Nevada and the BLM Wild Horse and Burro Office (partnering with the NRST) to improve the understanding of external perspectives related to land and resource management. Work will continue through FY 2015, including a summary of participant comments, recommendations for next steps, and process design for future stakeholder meetings.

Training and Capacity Building

The BLM continued to develop and offer ECCR training, and participated in Departmental and government-wide training opportunities in FY 2014, including:

- *Communicating with Diplomacy and Professionalism*
Prineville, Oregon, 27 students
- *Crucial Conversations*
Oregon (five times), 84 students
- *Effective Briefing and Presentation Skills*
Boise, Idaho, 32 students
- *Developing and Maintaining High Performance Teams*
Farmington, New Mexico, 39 students

- *Managing Emotions and Thriving Under Pressure*
Roseburg, Oregon, 20 students
- *Developing and Writing Effective Documents*
St. George, Utah, 18 Students
- *Managing by Network, Partnerships and Community Collaboration*
Academy, an on-line training program sponsored by the BLM focused on building collaborative partnerships with State, Federal, local, and private parties, and specifically addressing and resolving conflict, was completed by the Arizona Zone Social Scientist.
- *Wyoming Collaboration Conference* in Wyoming, sponsored by the University of Wyoming Ruckelshaus Institute, and included a skills and techniques workshop. Sessions covered approaches to place-based collaboration related to forests, wildlife, and energy development.
- *Collaboration in Natural Resource Management in Wyoming*
Sponsored by the Collaboration Program in Natural Resources at the Ruckelshaus Institute of the University of Wyoming, and coordinated with BLM staff and including significant contributions, presentations, and panel participation by management and leadership.

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

BOEM continues its efforts to incorporate ECCR principles into carrying out the mission of the bureau as well as increasing institutional capacity for ECCR processes. During FY 14 BOEM focused its ECCR efforts on:

e-Scoping for the Five Year Plan

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act established that the Secretary of the Interior must prepare an oil and gas leasing program every 5 years, showing the size, timing, and location of potential leasing activity as precisely as possible. Because oil and gas exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) may impact the environment, the economy, and numerous stakeholders, the OCS Lands Act process initiates a concurrent environmental review as required by NEPA. As part of the analysis of potential environmental effects, BOEM developed a programmatic EIS website that includes, among other things, background information, details about the proposed action, and helpful tips. BOEM also has developed a web-based interactive geospatial portal to investigate the proposed planning areas and explore maps about what is already known about the areas and draw maps to submit with comments. At public meetings, BOEM will provide computer stations to access the website and GeoPortal and provide electronic comments. (See *boemoceaninfo.com* and <https://www.csawebmap.com/boemoceaninfo/>)

Training

Environmental Collaboration and Conflict Resolution for the BOEM Office of Environmental Programs, Reston, VA, 20 students. The training was focused on applying GTCC concepts and skills to working with external stakeholders, using the spectrum of public engagement, exploring different sources of conflict in public decisions affecting the environment including ways to overcome obstacles, analyzing the potential for collaboration in upcoming activities, and practicing core collaboration skills

Tribal Engagement Strategy

In March 2013, the BOEM Director called for the creation of a Tribal Consultation Policy Working Group (Group) to develop recommendations for a BOEM Tribal Consultation Policy. The Group convened with the assistance of a facilitator for 3 days in December 2013. Representatives from each Region and Program office participated, developing recommendations for the development of BOEM's Tribal Consultation Guidance memo. Drawing from those recommendations and other sources, the Bureau Chief Environmental Officer issued Bureau Tribal Consultation Guidance on May 5, 2015, in a memorandum through BOEM's Acting Director (Guidance). The Guidance adopts and augments the Department's Tribal Consultation Policy, which calls for regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with Federally recognized tribes.

BOEM is moving forward to engage with Native Americans through an array of staff and programs, while coordinating internally and with other Department bureaus and the Department as a whole to avoid overwhelming tribes with requests and meetings and causing what is commonly referred to as "consultation fatigue." In particular, BOEM has been working to procure cultural awareness training for all tribal G2G representatives in BOEM and plans to hold sessions in 2015. The Bureau hopes to improve efficiency in this effort through Departmental coordination bringing bureaus together in larger forums. BOEM's Office of Renewable Energy Programs plans to host a "Tribal Summit" in 2015, including expense coverage for two tribal representatives from each Atlantic tribe. Because there are limited travel funds to bring Tribal representatives to Washington, coordination with other activities would be beneficial to both the Tribes and Federal Government.

Bureau of Reclamation:

BOR increased institutional and programmatic capacity for ECCR in FY 2014 by, among other things:

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program

BOR institutionalized use of ECCR techniques in its Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program. In this facilitated process, long term operational recommendations are being developed by consensus of a diverse set of stakeholders of the Colorado River including power customers, conservationists,

recreational interests, States and water customers (such as farmers and cities). Most of the operating recommendations developed by the entity have been accepted and implemented by the Secretary of the Interior, in her capacity as Water Master for the Colorado River. This Program, with its facilitated and collaborative process, has become the standard operating procedure for operation and management of the upper Colorado River, which has seen a dramatic decline in litigation in recent years. This is significant because the Colorado River Basin has been experiencing a severe drought over the past five years, and conflict is being managed better because of this Program.

BOR Owned / Operated Projects

BOR has incorporated ECCR techniques into projects owned and operated by BOR. For example, to minimize water conveyance losses due to several years of drought and the lowest irrigation water allocation from Rio Grande Project storage supplies in the 108-year history of the project, BOR engaged in a coordinated effort with the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) to synchronize the irrigation water releases between the two U.S. irrigation districts and Mexico. Beginning in 2012 and continuing through 2014, BOR coordinates the Rio Grande Project irrigation season schedules with Mexico as part of the standard operating procedures associated with operating this Project. BOR and the IBWC host monthly meetings with Mexico and the U.S. irrigation districts and provide information on Rio Grande Project water supplies and Rio Grande Basin hydrologic conditions.

Landscape Conservation Cooperatives

BOR has continued to institutionalize our use of ECCR techniques to avoid potential conflicts associated with multi-party efforts to address complicated natural resources issues as evidenced by the Desert Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs). The LCCs are a national network of partners, which include Federal agencies, States, Tribes, universities, non-governmental organizations, landowners and other stakeholders established to form diverse partnerships to address transboundary natural resources issues or concerns that may arise from overlapping jurisdictions, Tribal Trust responsibilities or a lack of resources. The goal of the LCCs is to address the long term impacts of climate change and management responses on a landscape-level basis. Due to the diverse membership, BOR and the USFWS engaged third party neutrals to ensure greater communications and understanding with and among the stakeholders and partners in order to address issues before they become conflicts.

NEPA and NHPA

BOR continues its use of ECCR techniques for addressing compliance with environmental statutes such as NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). BOR used ECCR techniques to assist in the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statements for the Long Term Experimental and Management Plan for the Glen Canyon Dam. Another example is associated

with development of a Programmatic Agreement for the Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project (NGWSP) in New Mexico. To resolve concerns regarding adverse effects from project undertakings and to avoid construction delays, BOR contracted for a cultural resources firm to facilitate workgroup consultation meetings and assist in a collaborative process for implementation of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The PA will cover all tribal-related actions and other agency consultations concerning construction of the project. Cultural resource issues are a source of ongoing disagreement among tribes, agencies, and stakeholders during construction of large projects. The signatories and concurring parties to the NGWSP PA represent a diverse, sometimes polarized group of stakeholders associated with the project area. BOR anticipates that continuing this facilitated, collaborative process will yield beneficial results throughout the life of the project.

Threatened or Endangered Species

BOR has continued to institutionalize its use of ECCR processes in basins where a recovery program is in place for threatened or endangered species. The Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program (Collaborative Program), in place since 2002, is a multi-stakeholder effort located in New Mexico consisting of 16 Federal, state and local governmental entities; Indian Tribes and Pueblos; and non-governmental organizations representing diverse interests. The Collaborative Program is intended to serve as the vehicle and mechanism to maintain compliance with the USFWS 2003 Biological Opinion on the Middle Rio Grande. The objectives of the participants are to prevent extinction, preserve reproductive integrity, improve habitat, support scientific analysis and promote recovery of listed species in the basin. Collaborative Program activities include water acquisition and management, habitat restoration, endangered species monitoring and Rio Grande Silvery Minnow propagation. A facilitated process, initiated in 2009 during the transition phase of the Collaborative Program into a Recovery Implementation Program (RIP), continues to move forward. Due in part to improved relationships among the parties, in 2014 BOR served as the mediator/facilitator among the non-federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 consultation parties, the State of New Mexico, and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District to update the biological assessment (BA) on Middle Rio Grande water management and operations.

Tribal Nations

BOR has continued its use of ECCR processes as it interacts with Tribal nations. For example, after many years of disputes and litigation, the Nez Perce Tribe, NOAA Fisheries, and BOR reached a settlement agreement in 2014 to administratively stay ESA litigation concerning the effects of operations and maintenance of the Lewiston Orchards Project in Idaho on listed steelhead populations. The primary purpose of the 2014 Agreement is to continue efforts to complete a full water exchange and title transfer of the Project as a

comprehensive solution to ESA and Tribal Trust issues. Significant progress has been made, the relationship between the parties has improved significantly, and the parties are making progress towards implementation of the terms of the settlement agreement.

Training

For the past several years, BOR, through its Research program, has collaborated with Dr. Aaron Wolf of Oregon State University on water conflict management research and the development of a manual and a set of teaching modules to provide collaborative competency training for BOR employees. The training is unique in that it draws from Reclamation staff experiences specifically with water resource conflicts. This training asks -- *“How can we move debates about water resource issues beyond entrenched positions? What are some less confrontational approaches that bring conflicting interests and institutions together to craft workable solutions; ones that build community rather than disrupt it? Can we find solutions that work across different scales of both time and space? What are some ways we ourselves can work more peacefully within contentious situations?”* Through this training, BOR water managers are provided with resources and tools to enhance consensus building and relationship building skills. This set of specialized tools and teaching modules has been designed to aid managers in detecting, preventing, and mitigating water related conflicts, and fostering collaboration. Participants develop the ability to address conflict at several different levels: interpersonal, interagency, interregional, and international. They also provide suggestions for helping better prepare BOR staff to proactively monitor and plan for change; to detect and resolve unforeseen conflict; and to create agency-wide incentives for conflict management and prevention.

US Fish and Wildlife Service:

The Fish and Wildlife Service built institutional capacity to engage in ECCR in FY 2013 by offering training courses and by sponsoring several ECCR-related initiatives. Each year the National Conservation Training Center (NCTC) conducts approximately 18 courses, attended by 400-500 students, that help build capacity in the FWS and other agencies in collaborative problem solving.

The FWS National Wildlife Refuge System Inventory and Monitoring (I&M) national initiative is charged to develop a high-level action plan that maps out implementation of previously identified priorities. I&M developed and is implementing an approach with other USFWS programs as well as key partners. In support these goals, the Wildlife Refuge System worked to engage strategic partners in discussing the continued development and maintenance of shared databases as well as shared monitoring objectives and protocols. I&M has focused on engaging USFWS staff, strategic partners and citizens in workshops and discussions to provide input and direction toward development of workbook to provide tools and guidance for refuge staff to use when implementing a citizen science based monitoring effort.

The National Park Service:

The following two initiatives are examples of how NPS increased its institutional capacity for ECCR in FY 2014:

People from a number of NPS programs and activities are working on civic/stakeholder engagement processes and participating in conversations to promote more support within NPS for ECCR activities and best practices. While there is no single “agency step”, there are a variety of program-specific efforts and practices and training about application of ECCR practices. NPS has documented and encouraged institutional capacity and collaboration and conflict resolution including: Planner’s Chat sessions, webinars on Climate Change, Scaling Up: Collaborative Approaches to Large Landscape Conservation sharing information regarding large landscape conservation techniques, and ongoing Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance engagement with communities. ECCR-related briefings occurred for NPS leadership as various management positions transitioned and successors took office.

Collaboration Clinics. This is an emerging model for helping NPS staff, stakeholders, and partners develop the specialized skills they need to work collaboratively for more effective planning, decision-making and resource management. Many aspects of existing NPS policy and guidance speak to the value of developing integrated, collaborative approaches to accomplishing our mission and getting our collective work done. Collaboration Clinics provide planners, superintendents, park staff and other decision-makers practical training, coaching, and practice in using collaborative approaches and processes. Collaboration Clinics also use a train-the-trainer model to increase internal capacity and the potential for expanding the program.

Collaboration Clinic trainers work with intact park units and other clinic sites to increase the in-house collaborative capacity in a way that is tailored to a park’s particular needs or situation. Clinic content combines elements of many different disciplines including communication, conflict resolution, consensus building, designing collaborative processes, facilitation, mediation, group dynamics, neuroscience, planning, interest-based negotiation, public participation, having difficult conversations, organizational development and more.

Clinic trainers are NPS and DOI staff (including CADR) that are trained and experienced in facilitation and collaborative problem solving. Coaches approach each Clinic site as a symbiotic community of players -- some Federal employees, business people or local officials, and passionate individuals or organizational partners.

Four Collaboration Clinics were held in 2014: Intermountain Regional Office (Denver, CO), Mississippi National River & Recreation Area / St. Croix National Scenic Riverway (St. Paul, MN), New Bedford Whaling National Historic Park (New Bedford, MA), Train-the-Trainer (Denver, CO).

Office of Hearings and Appeals:

The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) exercises the delegated authority of the Secretary of the Interior to conduct hearings and decide appeals from decisions of the bureaus and offices of the Department of the Interior. Within OHA, Interior Board of Indian Appeals (IBIA) address Indian matters; and the Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA) addresses the use and disposition of public lands and their resources, mineral resources on the Outer Continental Shelf, and the conduct of surface coal mining operations under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act. Appeals can have an ECCR component.

Both the and the Interior Board of Land Appeals continue to encourage parties to consider direct negotiations or ADR to resolve or narrow the issues in pending appeals. When a case is docketed with either Board the docketing notice informs the parties about ADR options and encourages negotiations. Parties are also informed they may contact the CADR Office for assistance in considering ADR options and identifying a mediator or facilitator to assist them. The Boards will suspend consideration of an appeal to allow parties the time to participate in settlement discussions.

Each Board will affirmatively direct the parties to discuss settlement, if the lead judge, in reviewing the appeal, believes that the case is suitable for ADR. IBLA specifically evaluates ADR suitability during its disposition of stay petitions, and directs the parties to discuss settlement in appropriate cases. (An automatic stay applies in IBIA appeals, so that Board does not stay petitions.) The Departmental Case Hearings Division (DCHD) uses telephone conferences to discuss settlement prospects with the parties in cases where a hearing has been requested.

Office of the Secretary:

The Secretary of the Interior continued its support of the Commission on Indian Trust Administration and Reform under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which conducted a comprehensive evaluation of Interior's trust management of nearly \$4 billion in American Indian trust assets and provide recommendations on how to improve performance. The Office of the Secretary, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Special Trustee and professional impartial facilitators provided support for the work of the Commission and assisted with public outreach. The Commission issued a final report on December 10, 2013.

The Department of the Interior also continued to conduct facilitated regional consultation meetings with Tribal leaders regarding the land consolidation component of the settlement of the Cobell litigation. The Secretary of the Interior also issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking as part of considering whether to propose an administrative rule that would facilitate the reestablishment of a government-to-government relationship with the Native Hawaiian community, to more effectively implement the special political and

trust relationship that Congress has established between that community and the United States. A series of public meetings on the islands of Hawaii, Kauai, Lānai, Maui, Molokai, and Oahu and several in-person consultations with federally recognized tribes in the continental United States were held to consider the issues.

In FY 2014, CADR was given additional an FTE to support ECCR and tribal work and CADR's ECCR IDIQ contract which declared to be a strategic sourcing initiative Department-wide.

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement:

OSM strengthened its institutional capacity to engage in ECCR by continuing to use a broad array of partnering activities in carrying out the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act. In FY 2014, OSMRE continued with many partnerships among State and Tribal governments, industry, citizens, and public interest groups and worked with several States to resolve compliance issues with implementation of their regulatory programs.

OSMRE participates with other DOI Bureaus and Federal Agencies to ensure federal regulations are carried out in an efficient and effective manner. In addition, OSMRE relies on State and Tribal activities to accomplish its Government and Performance Result Act (GPRA) goals of reclaiming abandoned coal mine sites, and monitoring impacts from active mining to retain within the permitted area (i.e., limit the number of off-site impacts).

Office of the Solicitor:

The Office of the Solicitor continues to build capacity in ECCR with a concentration in the training area. Again this year, all senior executives were required, through their performance plans, to commit to training staff in an ADR, collaborative action, or other problem-solving training. The Associate Solicitor for Administration, who also serves as Senior Counsel-CADR, continues to provide assistance to attorneys wanting to explore with clients the use of ADR or other collaborative processes. Throughout the year, the Associate Solicitor for Administration provided assistance in confidential convening conversations with parties exploring ADR in land and Indian Affairs appeals, and also coordinated with the CADR Office in doing so. Training continues to be developed through the Solicitor's Office Junior Attorney Committee to provide opportunities for more junior attorneys to get exposure to the ECCR, ADR, and collaborative problem solving approaches. In 2014, our Honors Attorneys each rotated through SOL Administration/CADR for a six-week assignment. All of them received public participation training and attended an in-house conference on the ESA where several modules focused on ADR, negotiation, and problem solving. The Solicitor's Office views these as important steps in continuing to build capacity and champions for the use of ADR, ECCR, and other collaborative approaches.

2. **ECCR Investments and Benefits**

- a) Please describe any methods your agency uses to identify the (a) investments made in ECCR, and (b) benefits realized when using ECCR.

Examples of investments may include ECCR programmatic FTEs, dedicated ECCR budgets, funds spent on contracts to support ECCR cases and programs, etc.

Examples of benefits may include cost savings, environmental and natural resource results, furtherance of agency mission, improved working relationship with stakeholders, litigation avoided, timely project progression, etc.

The Department of the Interior tracks investments through the ECCR Report and other means.

Through the ECCR Report, we have gathered data relating to investments in FTEs, contracts, and technological solutions that track ECCR processes. Investments in FTEs and the new DOI ECCR contract are discussed more fully with respect to Question 1.

Investments in human resources are tracked through performance plans. Conflict management and collaboration performance standards are included in the performance plans of all Senior Executive Service (SES) positions to encourage appropriate use of conflict management and collaborative problem-solving. The CADR office advocates and encourages inclusion of conflict management and collaborative problem-solving performance standards for all DOI employees.

Investments in processes are tracked through the use of multi-agency evaluation instruments to evaluate process use and measure the performance of ECCR and related activities including training and internal team or group facilitation as well as external situation assessments, facilitated or mediated conflict resolution processes or consensus-building processes. In FY 2009 CADR obtained permission from OMB to independently use the evaluation instruments developed through the Multi-Agency Evaluation Survey (MAES) led by the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (USIECR). The data collected through these instruments are analyzed with an eye towards improving process design, as well as evaluating agency and individual performance and process outcomes.

In general the Department-wide capacity to track and report on ECCR activity remains unreliable and inconsistent. However, it does appear that the process of preparing the annual ECCR reports has improved the capacity of bureaus to gather information on ECCR cases, as is evidenced by the increase in reported cases and depth of information provided since the first Report was compiled in FY 2006.

Conflicts in formal administrative or judicial forums are tracked through a case docket system. The Interior Board of Land Appeals, Board of Indian Appeals, and the Department Case Hearings Division rely on their dockets to track the status of their cases, which includes information on whether a case is in ADR.

Individual bureaus and offices reported the following additional information on their ability to track the use and outcomes of ECCR during FY 2014:

BLM: The BLM's Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution (CADR) Specialist participates regularly in the Interior Dispute Resolution Council as a primary BLM investment in collaborative capacity. Two significant capacity building efforts which BLM actively participated in development and supports ongoing management of are:

- DOI In-house Roster of Facilitators, and
- DOI Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract for ECCR services.

The BLM tracks investments and benefits through active staff engagement. The BLM currently has one full-time employee dedicated to ECCR support, the Bureau's Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution Specialist in the Washington Office. The BLM also engages State and Center CADR Coordinators with experience and dedication to public participation, collaboration, and dispute resolution fields. Members participate as collateral duty to various positions held within the BLM

The BLM State and Field office regularly engage collaboratively with the public and other agencies in project development and NEPA analysis. Stakeholders participate in ECCR and, more often, unassisted collaborative activities throughout BLM's major planning efforts. Stakeholders can track their recommendations as they are reflected in the draft and final planning documents and Records of Decision. The BLM's ePlanning effort is helping to make this participation easier and more accessible in addition to making the tracking information more transparent and readily available. ECCR and unassisted processes are increasingly being tracked through BLM's Geographic Information Systems (GIS) as well.

BOR: For many projects owned by the United States, through the BOR, the water users are partners and manage and operate the projects on a day to day basis and have long term contractual relationships to deliver water and power. In some situations, the tone and tenor of the relationships has declined – to the point where it could potentially affect the operations of the facilities and the delivery of water and power to other contractors. One example is along the Big Horn River in Montana, where several years ago, the water users were not satisfied with how BOR managed the Yellowtail Dam and reservoir, which affected the management of water in the basin and caused conflict between the states of Montana and Wyoming. In response, the Bighorn Issues Group was formed, which was costly at first – due to the costs associated with the facilitator(s) and all of the time and resources needed to coordinate and

consult on water management decisions. In the long term, trust was built, the issues are easier to address, and the Issues Group rarely meets now because of the trust level.

NPS:

NPS tracks ECCR that is being used in NEPA processes through its Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) on-line project management system. This system captures events associated with NEPA processes. The NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) system has enabled NPS to efficiently organize, consider and strategically respond to a large volume of public comment on controversial projects. The PEPC system encourages the public to engage in park planning by making up-to-date information easily available in one site on planning projects in parks across the country.

OHA:

OHA utilizes its docketing system to track cases, including cases that have been referred for direct or assisted negotiation.

OSMRE: Early in FY 2014, OSMRE initiated three government efficiency work groups with its State and Tribal partners to address the continuing fiscal impacts on program implementation and to develop potential solutions. Two of the three groups utilized facilitators from DOI's roster:

1. SMCRA Program Financial Stability Work Group – developed options that would provide alternative, stable means of fiscal support to enable the States and OSMRE to fulfill their statutory obligations; and
2. Training/TIPS Sustainability Work Group – developed options for a unified training/TIPS program in order to reduce costs and to enable the efficient delivery of all training and TIPS needs of the States, Tribes and OSMRE.

Review of the reports and work groups' concepts and recommendations are currently underway OSMRE-wide and by the States and Tribes.

Another collaborative effort continuing in FY 2014 is OSMRE's GeoMine Project. The GeoMine Project is an interactive geospatial data sharing system for State and Federal agencies that have responsibilities regarding coal mining activities and decisions. OSMRE completed its two-year pilot project where it partnered with SMCRA regulatory programs in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and Federal agencies involved in SMCRA, Clean Water Act (CWA) and ESA regulation and consultation (EPA, FWS, Army Corps of Engineers) to develop the GeoMine interactive digital map of coal mining and reclamation activities. The phased deployment of the GeoMine to collect and provide access to SMCRA data nationwide is underway. This system will facilitate efficient and effective environmental reviews, permit planning, inspections, etc., among various DOI Bureaus, the States, and other Federal agencies.

b) Please report any (b) quantitative or qualitative results (benefits) you have captured during FY 2014.

Methods currently in use by DOI to measure the benefits of ECCR include, as noted above, multi-agency evaluation instruments to evaluate process use and measure the performance of ECCR and related activities including training and internal team or group facilitation as well as external situation assessments, facilitated or mediated conflict resolution processes or consensus-building processes. The data collected through these instruments are analyzed with an eye towards improving process design, as well as evaluating agency and individual performance and process outcomes. The two MAES large scale projects that have been undertaken by the USIECR indicate that there are several lasting benefits from using skilled third parties to resolve environmental conflict, including gains in trust among parties, sustainability of outcome, and reduction of the likelihood that parties will resort to litigation.

Individual bureaus and offices reported the following additional information on their ability to track the use and outcomes of ECCR during FY 2014:

BLM:

BLM leadership anecdotally has observed improvement nationwide with stakeholders, state and local governments, Tribes, other agencies/partners, and the public, as well as improved transparency and durability of decisions that made by the BLM, as a result of ECCR processes and other unassisted collaborative efforts. Qualitative benefits include:

- Anticipated resolution of a timber sale project that avoided litigation costs of a 9th Circuit appeal process and implemented the project one (or more) years earlier than a full appeal process would have allowed in BLM Oregon/Washington.
- BLM Utah's Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument's (GSENM) ECCR approach to the Livestock Grazing Management Plan Amendment has improved working relationships with a diversity of planning stakeholders. Also, GSENM efforts on public engagement and transparency in the planning process have been complimented by stakeholders.
- The BLM Utah State Office and National Park Service's National Trails Intermountain Region successfully agreed on an approach to developing the Old Spanish National Historic Trail Comprehensive Management Plan. This facilitated process allowed the two agencies' representatives to develop foundational understandings of each other's respective missions and policy mandates, which has resulted in vastly improved working relationships to support the project and timeline.
- BLM Wyoming has participated in and supported the CADR Program, building relationships with outside interests, agencies, and partners, and funding travel in support of the Governor's Task Force on Forests, Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative and the Governor's Sage-Grouse Implementation Team.

OSMRE:

OSMRE will discuss developing a tracking system to gather results on investments and efficiencies on the GeoMine Project in 2015.

- c) What difficulties have you encountered in generating cost and benefit information?

Tracking cost data on a DOI-wide basis is difficult due to the decentralized nature of the Department. However, some data is attainable. For instance, DOI agencies spent approximately \$2.8 million on the DOI CADR ECCR contract in FY 2014. Costs relating to labor performed by government personnel, on the other hand, are harder to assess, as DOI agencies do not require their personnel to break down their time into ECCR and non-ECCR time units.

We have found that it is much easier to generate qualitative, rather than quantitative, information regarding the benefits of these processes. Qualitatively, managers may conclude that without the services of a skilled third party, they would not have achieved a successful result. When they share this opinion, we view it as support for the value of these processes, despite the fact that it is subjective opinion.

3. **ECCR Use**:** Describe the level of ECCR use within your department/agency in FY 2014 by completing the table below. [Please refer to the definition of ECCR from the OMB-CEQ memo as presented on page one of this template. An ECCR “case or project” is an instance of neutral third-party involvement to assist parties in a collaborative or conflict resolution process

	Total FY 2014 ECCR Cases ²	Decision making forum that was addressing the issues when ECCR was initiated:					ECCR Cases or projects completed ³	ECCR Cases or Projects sponsored ⁴	Interagency ECCR Cases and Projects		
		Federal agency decision	Administrative proceedings /appeals	Judicial proceedings	Other (specify)				Federal only	Including non federal participants	
<i>Context for ECCR Applications:</i>											
Policy development	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>					<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>		
Planning	<u>52</u>	<u>48</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	Tribal	<u>4</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14</u>	
Siting and construction											
Rulemaking	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>					<u>1</u>				
License and permit issuance	<u>1</u>		<u>1</u>					<u>1</u>		<u>1</u>	
Compliance and enforcement action	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>		<u>1</u>			<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	
Implementation/Monitoring Agreements	<u>13</u>	<u>13</u>					<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	
Other (specify): Advisory, Procedural Citizen Science Framework MO Riv. Basin Interagency Roundtable Project Operations	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>					<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>10</u>	
TOTAL	<u>95</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>		<u>14</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>31</u>	
		(the sum of the Decision Making Forums should equal Total FY 2014 ECCR Cases)									

² An “ECCR case” is a case in which a third-party neutral was active in a particular matter during FY 2014.

³ A “completed case” means that neutral third party involvement in a particular ECCR case ended during FY 2014. The end of neutral third party involvement does not necessarily mean that the parties have concluded their collaboration/negotiation/dispute resolution process, that all issues are resolved, or that agreement has been reached.

⁴ Sponsored - to be a sponsor of an ECCR case means that an agency is contributing financial or in-kind resources (e.g., a staff mediator's time) to provide the neutral third party's services for that case. More than one sponsor is possible for a given ECCR case.

Note: If you subtract completed ECCR cases from Total FY 2014 cases it should equal total ongoing cases. If you subtract sponsored ECCR cases from Total FY 2014 ECCR cases it should equal total cases in which your agency or department participated but did not sponsor. If you subtract the combined interagency ECCR cases from Total FY 2014 cases it should equal total cases that involved only your agency or department with no other federal agency involvement.

4. ECCR Case Example

Using the template below, provide a description of an ECCR case (preferably completed in FY 2014). Please limit the length to no more than 2 pages.

Roan Plateau Naval Oil Shale Reserves – BLM Colorado

Overview of problem/conflict and timeline, including reference to the nature and timing of the third-party assistance, and how the ECCR effort was funded

The Roan Plateau, which soars thousands of feet above the Colorado River valley floor near the town of Rifle, is prized by hunters and environmental groups for its scenic vistas and wildlife and held in equal regard by oil and gas executives for the estimated 8.9 trillion cubic feet of natural gas locked in its rocks. There has been a challenge finding a balance between landscapes and resources, and both outdoor recreation and energy are critical to Colorado's economy.

The Roan Plateau Naval Oil Shale Reserves were transferred to BLM management in 1997 and analyzed in a Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), completed in 2008. The BLM held a lease sale in August 2008 for the Roan that generated \$113.9 million, documented as the highest dollar amount ever for an oil and gas lease sale in the lower 48 states. The settlement involves conservation groups that sued the federal government in 2008 the RMPA that allowed the Roan Plateau to be leased by oil and gas companies for drilling purposes.

The Roan RMPA/EIS was challenged by a consortium of environmental groups in 2008. In July 2012, the U.S. District Court of Colorado issued a decision that set aside portions of the EIS and asked BLM to reanalyze its decision. Other parties to the litigation appealed to the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. The 10th Circuit appointed a neutral mediator who was directly engaged in crafting the eventual settlement agreement. Numerous previous settlement negotiations, beginning in 2008, had failed prior to the appointment of a third-party mediator.

Summary of how the problem or conflict was addressed using ECCR, including details of any innovative approaches to ECCR, and how the principles for engagement in ECCR outlined in the policy memo were used

Each of the parties, including BLM, the consortium of environmental groups that challenged the BLM decision, and the oil and gas operators who hold the leases, successfully reached a consensus with the assistance of the neutral mediator after over six years, finding a middle ground on a very contentious issue.

Identify the key beneficial outcomes of this case, including references to likely alternative decision making forums and how the outcomes differed as a result of ECCR

The benefits of reaching a Settlement extend to all parties involved. It will allow the BLM to devote the requisite time and energy to the SEIS and to issue a new RMPA to manage the Roan Plateau, which is expected over the next two years. It will bring to a close the six-plus years of litigation on the RMPA, allowing development of existing leases to proceed. The Plaintiffs' concerns over the ecological values of the top of the Plateau will be addressed through protections in the Settlement Alternative that will be analyzed in the SEIS. Oil and gas companies will be able to apply for

permits to drill on the leases. The final compromise also means decades of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars for local communities.

The settlement, signed in November 2014, addresses the interests of all parties by limiting development-related impacts on the top of the plateau to the remaining two leases, while avoiding lengthy litigation delays that would significantly inhibit orderly development of leases at the base of the plateau. The settlement has marked the end of ongoing litigation. Now, BLM can move forward with the RMPA with all conflicting parties in agreement.

Reflections on the lessons learned from the use of ECCR

The settlement proves that natural landscapes and underground resources can exist together.

5. Other ECCR Notable Cases: Briefly describe any other notable ECCR cases in the past fiscal year. (Optional)

BLM:

BLM Oregon-Washington: Vantage to Pomona Heights Transmission Line Project:

State and local land use decisions must meet requirements and be compliant with the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and several counties will have land use permits and decisions to make for the project. However, there was no state agency SEPA Lead Agency designated for the Project and no unified environmental review or public outreach process was in place. The representative to the Pacific Northwest Regional Infrastructure Team (PNWRIT) from Washington Governor's Office, who is also on the Project Steering Committee, served as the third-party neutral.

Resolutions: WSDOT and Yakima County accepted the role as SEPA Co-leads and the WA Governor's Office issued letter to all potentially affected counties, local and state agencies and the Project's Steering Committee on SEPA leadership determination. Going forward BLM and WSDOT will ensure all remaining environmental review documents and public outreach efforts explicitly meet the requirements and are compliant with both the SEPA and NEPA.

BLM Nevada: Public Meeting Facilitation for Vegas/Pahrump Draft Resource Management Plan

As with many BLM draft Resource Management Plans, land use decisions remain highly contentious in southern Nevada. BLM Nevada engaged a third-party neutral to prepare public outreach panels, conduct

four separate public meetings, and write a summary report. Approximately 300 people participated in these public meetings, which took place in November 2014. The facilitators helped BLM prepare for the meetings and provide information and education about the draft RMP. The facilitators helped guide the tone and content of the meetings, assisting in addressing some challenging members of the audience and informing them about ways to make effective, substantive comments, including comments through testimony with transcribers elsewhere in the rooms.

Stakeholders discussed the draft plan with BLM subject matter experts and viewed documentation/maps. All attendees learned the steps to contribute substantive comments rather than vague complaints. Positive feedback consisted came from several public and local agency stakeholders who have participated in many other NEPA and land planning meetings with similar and different meeting formats.

BLM Wyoming: Chokecherry Sierra Madre Wind Farm Project Mitigation
BLM Wyoming engaged a third party neutral facilitator for the Chokecherry Sierra Madre Wind Farm Project mitigation committee to address compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The mitigation meetings were held by BLM as part of the Chokecherry Sierra Madre (CCSM) programmatic agreement stipulation to collaboratively produce a Cultural Mitigation Plan for treatment/mitigation of adverse effects to historic properties that includes the Overland Trail, Lincoln Highway, and the Pine Grove stage station. After a few years of unsuccessful negotiations between the interested parties, Wyoming SHPO and the project proponent regarding the scale of the mitigation (in relation to the magnitude of the project), the talks stalled out and participants became frustrated, becoming somewhat hostile and argumentative. There were concerns that the process would break down.

Although previous tensions eased and people were having good discussions, there was still an air of mistrust among the participants. While BLM anticipated agreement on a final mitigation plan in the fall of 2014, BLM arranged another face-to-face meeting scheduled for January 2015. The purpose is to further establish renewed trust between the participants, provide them an opportunity to express their views on the mitigation plan, and “air out” existing differences in order to move forward in an agreeable fashion to everyone. BLM Wyoming is working toward a final mitigation plan, anticipating that all parties can come to a resolution this Spring 2015.

BOEM:

BOEM actively engages interested and affected in parties in the coastal states to identify concerns associated with renewable energy data collection, technology testing, and commercial activities off of the coast of the United States. In FY 2014 BOEM sponsored events which sought

stakeholder and public input into its renewable energy projects and policies and was assisted by a third party neutral.

BOR:

Structured Decision-Making Workshops to Assist in Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a Long-Term Experimental and Management Plan (LTEMP) for Glen Canyon Dam

In December 2010, Secretary Ken Salazar announced the DOI's intention to work with stakeholders on the LTEMP EIS. A Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on July 6, 2011, and identified the Bureau of Reclamation and National Park Service (NPS) as co-lead agencies. There are 14 cooperating agencies (including six tribes) involved in this EIS. A primary function of the LTEMP EIS will be to continue the successful experiments completed under the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program. Dam operations and other actions under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior will be considered for inclusion in alternatives in the LTEMP EIS, in keeping with the scope of the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992. This will be the first EIS completed on the operation of Glen Canyon Dam since 1995, which was a major point of demarcation in attempting to achieve a balance between project purposes and natural resources protection. Scoping for the LTEMP EIS was completed early in 2012 and draft EIS development is currently in progress. A draft EIS is expected in 2014.

NPS:

NPS Natural Resources Advisory Group Facilitation, 2014-2019

The Natural Resource Advisory Group (NRAG) is a group comprised of park superintendents and senior leadership within the National Park Service (NPS). There are two primary functions of NRAG: (1) advocating for improving natural resource management in parks by addressing issues, conflicts, or disputes related to management, and (2) advising the Associate Director of Natural Resource Stewardship and Science on issues affecting natural resources. NRAG seeks input from regional leadership, regional natural resource advisory groups, central offices, and regional directors, and provides assistance to the Associate Director for Natural Resource Stewardship and Science as needed.

NPS-BOR Glen Canyon Dam Joint EIS Process, 2012-2015

The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and the National Park Service (NPS) are preparing an EIS to evaluate dam operations. The purpose is to identify options for adaptive management of Glen Canyon Dam over the next 15 to 20 years, consistent with the Grand Canyon Protection Act (GCPA) and other federal laws. The EIS will evaluate possible alternatives that would meet the GCPA's requirements as well as minimize adverse impacts on downstream natural and cultural resources.

This includes evaluation of visitor use of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and Grand Canyon National Park, and analysis of possible impacts on important resources to Tribes. The EIS will better inform the Department of the Interior so it can meet statutory responsibilities for: protecting downstream resources for future generations; conserving species listed under the ESA; protecting American Indian Tribal interests; meeting water delivery obligations; and generating hydroelectric power.

National Parks Overflights Advisory Group, 2009-2015

The National Parks Overflights Advisory group (NPOAG) was established in March 2001 in response to requirements under the National Parks Air Tour Management Act of 2000 (the Act). The NPOAG is comprised of representatives from general aviation, commercial air tour operations, environmental groups, and Tribes. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Director of NPS (or their designees) serve as ex officio members of the group. Representatives of the Administrator and Director serve alternating 1-year terms as NPOAG Chair. The NPOAG, in accordance with the Act, provides advice, information, and recommendations to the Administrator and the Director on: implementation of the Act and its amendments; commonly accepted quiet aircraft technology for use in commercial air tour operations over a national park or tribal lands, which will receive preferential treatment in a given air tour management plan; other measures that might be taken to accommodate the interests of visitors to national parks; and, if requested, safety, environmental, and other issues related to commercial air tour operations over a national park or tribal lands.

6. Priority Uses of ECCR:

Please describe your agency's efforts to address priority or emerging areas of conflict and cross-cutting challenges either individually or in coordination with other agencies. For example, consider the following areas: NEPA, ESA, CERCLA, energy development, energy transmission, CWA 404 permitting, tribal consultation, environmental justice, management of ocean resources, infrastructure development, National Historic Preservation Act, other priority areas.

All areas of conflict are “priority” areas of conflict for the Department of the Interior. Any conflict that might impede DOI in carrying out its mission is conflict that warrants attention. With that in mind, bureaus reported the following specific areas of priority use of ECCR in FY 2014:

BLM:

The BLM has placed special emphasis on the use of ECCR and unassisted collaborative activities among a number of priority areas of conflict and cross-cutting challenges both individually and in coordination with other agencies. These include:

- NEPA throughout the BLM’s planning process and in implementation decisions;
- ESA though the efforts working across administrative boundaries in support of conservation of the Greater Sage-Grouse and support of habitat.
- Fact-finding on the development of a groundwater monitoring plan in conjunction with an approved geothermal expansion project; considering a third-party neutral facilitator to assist in plan development efforts.
- Regional infrastructure projects focusing on ecologically effective cross-jurisdictional, cross-agency landscape-scale mitigation strategies and options for species or natural resources.
- National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 for associated travel management planning and NEPA compliance for the Mojave Desert Ecosystem Program (MDEP), which is developing a predictive model that identifies cultural resources sensitivity areas for early assessment and evaluation.
- Energy development and energy transmission in support of a continued significant expansion in overall renewable energy development across BLM lands, which include the leading of programmatic efforts for solar energy zones in conjunction with proactively addressing competing interests and multiple-use challenges for current and future development.
- On-going Tribal consultation throughout the BLM organization continuing to implement DOI Tribal Consultation Policy and improve Tribal consultation practices and Government-to-Government relations.
- Forest practices in Western Oregon areas under the O&C Lands Act, as well as forest health task forces in Wyoming that address economic value as well as the reduction of the rising costs of fire

suppression.

- Big horn sheep and domestic sheep working group in Wyoming to address the conflicts between the species.

BOR

For the BOR, there have been two priority areas where ECCR has been used successfully. The first is in project operations – aiding in decision making related to water and power releases and operations and maintenance. Such examples include the Big Horn Issue Group, associated with management of the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir in Montana, operations of the Rio Grande Project in New Mexico and Texas and the Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Work Group, which guides the operations of Glen Canyon Dam.

The other area is related to facilitating the compliance with Federal environmental laws such as NEPA, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) –and the ESA. Case examples - include development of a Programmatic Agreement for the Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project (NGWSP), the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program; Structured Decision-Making Workshops to Assist in Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a Long-Term Experimental and Management Plan (LTEMP) for Glen Canyon Dam; and the Klamath Project operations coordinated ESA Section 7 consultation process

BOEM: BOEM has focused on using ECCR in its renewable energy program. With the help of expert third party assistance acquired through the CADR ECCR contract, BOEM sponsored four public meetings in FY 2014 that were designed to inform and seek input from the public on renewable energy policy relating to coastal waters.

NPS:

NPS continues to utilize ECCR to engage the public and interested parties with respect to park planning. Other examples include:

Large Landscape Collaboration (LCC).

An active NPS initiative called “Scaling Up” from the NPS Call to Action. The goal of large landscape conservation is to focus on land and water issues / concerns at an appropriate geographic scale, regardless of political and jurisdictional boundaries; such efforts are typically multijurisdictional, multipurpose, and multi-stakeholder, and they operate at various geographic scales using a variety of governance arrangements and public-private partnerships. A number of examples occurred in 2014, such as:

- March 17, the Crown Managers Forum was an opportunity to highlight specific issues that affect resources across the Crown ecosystem. The 2014 forum theme was Adaptive Management in

the Crown of the Continent Ecosystem. The forum provided an opportunity not only to learn about agency programs, but also to collectively discuss strategies for building trans-boundary partnerships in the Crown of Continent ecosystem.

- For the NPS “Scaling Up” portfolio, see the publication “Scaling Up, Collaborative Approaches to Large Landscape Conservation,” found at:

<http://www.nps.gov/orgs/1412/upload/Scaling-Up-2014.pdf>

Other topics and activities include:

- Urban Landscapes
- Chesapeake Bay
- Indigenous Cultural Landscapes
- Chesapeake - digital technology innovations (conservation priorities)
- Facilitating collaboration in large landscapes
- Chesapeake landscape collaborative
- National Heritage Areas
- Water Rights - panel of several western National Heritage Areas;
- "Made In Pennsylvania" - landscape of the Industrial Revolution in Pennsylvania;
- Canals, Greenways, & Blueways - panel of National Heritage Areas with canal resources;
- Urban NHAs how NHA networks work in urban landscapes
- Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance (RTCA)
- NRSS - conservation innovation in science - with NPS, Wilderness Conservation Society and NatureServe

NPS Collaboration Clinics

The NPS Rivers, Trails & Conservation Assistance Program (RTCA), in partnership with the CADR Office and other NPS staff, is piloting Collaboration Clinics to help NPS staff and leadership develop specialized skills needed to work more collaboratively across disciplines and with external partners and stakeholders in order to support more effective planning, decision making and resource management. The program is currently being conducted at NPS sites to increase collaborative capacity while focusing on site-specific situations. Using a lead trainer/ apprentice trainer model, clinics also prepare future trainers. The NPS is gearing up to hold 10-12 clinics per year at the invitation of NPS units.

OSMRE:

Rulemaking/Public Participation

The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) incorporates public participation processes within the law by establishing various

means to: 1) gather and solicit public comments with regard to mining regulations, program approvals, and project selection, and 2) provide a forum for concerned citizens to request a federal review of state enforcement actions perceived as inconsistent with SMCRA. These provisions of SMCRA include procedures for areas such as: public participation during federal rulemaking, state program approval/disapproval processes, enforcement of permit conditions, and selection of abandoned mine land projects.

OSMRE requests that citizens submit written comments regarding federal rulemaking and state program approvals. In addition, there is an opportunity to request a public meeting to be held on such issues. Negotiated rulemaking is not used by OSMRE because the law is explicit in outlining the requirements for states and coal operators. The federal regulations and state program approval procedures employed are intended to solicit, consider, and respond to various stakeholder comments as part of the decision making process.

Citizens also have opportunities to raise concerns regarding alleged mining company violations of permit provisions as part of the citizens' complaint process. Also, when contracts are being considered for abandoned mine land projects, public notification is made in local newspapers, etc. and comments are requested. Because such provisions exist in the organic legislation and regulations, resolution processes are already incorporated and do not involve third-party neutrals.

Compliance and Enforcement Action: Alternative Enforcement

OSMRE has taken a lead role in promoting and facilitating alternative enforcement methods for use by state and federal program regulators. Alternative enforcement involves various actions that surface coal mining regulators may employ when the primary enforcement actions authorized under the SMCRA fail to achieve abatement or correction of violations. This involves using negotiation techniques aimed to reach settlement terms to correct violations and/or reclaim land. OSMRE has facilitated agreements (serving as third-party neutral) between operators and state regulators. OSMRE has also been a party to such agreements when OSMRE is the federal program

7. Non-Third-Party-assisted Collaboration Processes: Briefly describe other significant uses of environmental collaboration that your agency has undertaken in FY 2014 to anticipate, prevent, better manage, or resolve environmental issues and conflicts that do not include a third-party neutral. *Examples may include interagency MOUs, enhanced public engagement, and structural committees with the capacity to resolve disputes, etc.*

DOI Agencies collaborated without the aid of a third party on many occasions in FY 2014. Here are some illustrative examples:

BLM:

BLM Alaska

Example 1: BLM-Alaska Resources Division issued two Instruction Memoranda (IMs) that will affect how placer miners reclaim streams and how they post financial guarantees of mining reclamation. The potential controversy surrounding these IMs was abated by an ambitious outreach plan that provided briefings to the state's congressional delegation and state and federal agencies as well as frequent updates, presentations, mailings, and short courses to individual miners and all significant mining organizations prior to the IM's release.

Example 2: In 2013, ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc. (CPAI) submitted an application with BLM for issuance of a right-of-way grant and related authorizations to construct, operate, and maintain a drill site, access road, pipelines, and ancillary facilities to support development of petroleum resources in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska (NPR-A). The proposed drill site location, and majority of the infield roads and pipeline route are on BLM-managed lands near the village of Nuiqsut, an Inupiaq Eskimo community, and a portion of the pipeline and road are located on Kuukpik Native Corporation lands.

Throughout 2014, BLM has been preparing a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the project that tiers to an earlier EIS and the NPR-A Final Integrated Activity Plan/EIS. Given this is the first proposed development in the NPR-A, the BLM made the decision to carry out an intentionally robust cooperative inter-agency effort as part of the SEIS process, including the State and local North Slope entities. The BLM has held weekly teleconference meetings with the cooperating agencies (USFWS, USBOEM, USEPA, USACE, North Slope Borough, State of Alaska, and Native Village of Nuiqsut) and several in-depth face-to-face meetings. In addition, the project lead and staff of the Arctic Field Office have been holding weekly tribal consultation phone calls with the Native Village of Nuiqsut (NVN) to ensure they understand the NEPA process and are fully informed regarding the analysis and potential impacts to their community. As a result, the NVN has played an important role in helping BLM to identify several new potential mitigation measures for the project. In response to questions that came up

during the consultation meetings, the BLM also scheduled and facilitated several meetings with NVN and other interested parties on topics that were beyond the scope of the SEIS, such as Emergency Response Plans, contamination vectors for subsistence foods, and road construction. Through this continued and sustained interaction with the NVN, BLM Alaska has developed a closer working relationship with the tribe that, given their proximity to oil and gas development, has the potential to be most affected by BLM decisions.

Example 3: An interdisciplinary group of staff and managers from BLM Alaska presented a short course at the Alaska Miners Association spring conference in Fairbanks. The goal of the course was to help miners understand regulatory requirements and learn how to navigate the process of planning and operating successful mining operations on BLM-managed lands.

After an introductory presentation, employees from the Fairbanks District, Anchorage District, and the Alaska State Office hosted six breakout stations which included the following topics: 1) Undue and Unnecessary Degradation and Performance Standards; 2) Plan Completeness and BLM supplements to the Alaska Placer Mining Application form; 3) Erosion Control and Re-vegetation; 4) Reclamation and Reclamation Planning; 5) Baseline Data Requirements and Reclamation Effectiveness Monitoring and 6) Bonding and Reclamation Cost Estimates. Participants in the short course rotated through the stations to learn about all six topics. Participants convened in an open discussion with BLM staff to ask questions, express concerns, and provide feedback on what additional steps BLM could take to help them successfully mine on public lands. The participants expressed appreciation for the opportunity to interact with staff from all of the programs that participate in evaluation of mining plans and assessment of mine reclamation. The content developed for the class will be used in future open houses and outreach efforts to reach a broader audience and communicate efforts to improve management of mining in Alaska.

General participation in unassisted collaboration:

The Federal Subsistence Program in Alaska has ten Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils, whose public members serve to advise the Federal Subsistence Board (FSB) on regulatory and policy matters under the Board's purview.

The Interagency Staff Committee (ISC) is comprised of representatives from BLM, the USFWS, BIA, NPS, USDA, Forest Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The ISC supports the FSB with technical expertise relating to the adoption of regulations, the implementation of monitoring programs, and policy development related to subsistence uses on federally managed public lands.

North Slope Science Initiative Science Technical Advisory Panel: The Science Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) is a legislatively-mandated Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) group consisting of not more than 15 scientists and technical experts from diverse professions and. The panel's duties are to provide recommendations to the North Slope Science Initiative Oversight Group and Executive Director on the inventory, monitoring and research needed for resource decisions on the North Slope of Alaska and adjacent marine environments.

North Slope Science Initiative Oversight Group: The Oversight Group (OG) is the senior-level management from the North Slope Science Initiative member and advisory entities. The OG sets direction for the initiative and cascades that direction through its member agencies; sets vision and goals for the initiative, and provides executive level leadership.

Regional Interagency Working Group on Coordination of Domestic Energy Development and Permitting in Alaska: This group was formed by Executive Order 13580, which acknowledged many federal agencies have overlapping authorities and responsibilities to address various aspects of Alaska energy development issues. The Executive Order was designed to facilitate the coordination of relevant agency reviews, thereby enabling a more orderly, efficient and informed approach to permitting both renewable and conventional energy projects in Alaska. The U.S. Coast Guard chairs the regional group and membership includes all federal agencies having permit responsibilities in Alaska.

Arctic Policy Group: The Arctic Policy Group is chaired by the U.S. Department of State and includes all federal agencies with responsibilities in the U.S. Arctic. It is a forum to communicate Arctic Council activities and receive recommendations to the Department on policy issues related to the Arctic.

Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program: This international working group responds to the critical needs of monitoring in the circumpolar Arctic. To address these needs, the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) Working Group of the Arctic Council created the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP). CAFF's CBMP is working with scientists and local resource users from around the Arctic to enhance long-term arctic biodiversity monitoring efforts. The Terrestrial Expert Monitoring Group (TEMG), co-led by the North Slope Science Initiative is one of four Expert Monitoring Groups (EMGs) created by the CBMP to develop integrated, ecosystem-based monitoring plans for the Arctic's major biomes. Each of the groups (Marine, Coastal, Freshwater, and Terrestrial) functions as a forum for scientists, community experts, and managers to promote, share, and coordinate research and monitoring activities, and to use existing data and knowledge to facilitate improved, cost-effective monitoring that can detect and understand significant trends in arctic biodiversity. These efforts will be

coordinated through the implementation of these integrated, pan-arctic biodiversity monitoring plans.

Ecosystem-Based Management Expert Working Group: This group, with U.S. delegation that includes the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Departments of the Interior, Commerce and State, is addressing the need for more integrated management within the circumpolar Arctic.

Other working groups that BLM Alaska participates in include:

- The Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group
- Game Management Unit 23 Working Group
- Alaska Geographic
- Alaska Public Land Information Centers
- Alaska Climate Change Executive Roundtable (ACER)
- Landscape Conservation Cooperatives
- Regional Ecological Assessments

BLM Arizona

Example 1: The BLM Arizona Strip District and Arizona Strip Field Office has a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians that describes how they will work together on various undertakings as defined by law. This document streamlined the consultation process as defined under the National Historic Preservation Act and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). The MOU was negotiated on a government-to-government basis, and was executed to better define roles in ongoing collaborative reviews and projects, as well as to clarify the timing and types of consultation that would take place in the future. This MOU will allow the BLM and the Kaibab Paiutes to collaborate more efficiently, with fewer misunderstandings, and will improve government-to-government relations between the two parties.

Example 2: The BLM Arizona Tucson Field Office has initiated a collaborative planning effort for the development of a Resource Management Plan for the San Pedro National Riparian Conservation Area (SPRNCA). The Field Office is using a collaborative approach to developing an analysis of the management situation and to gathering and understanding stakeholder concerns and issues. The SPRNCA is a rare desert river management area, and is the subject of International, National, regional, State, and local concerns. Using collaborative methods in plan development will increase the likelihood of management options that address a wide range of concerns, as well as allowing a broad array of stakeholders to take part in the plan development process.

General participation in unassisted collaborative activities: BLM Arizona encourages use of collaborative techniques to reach broader audiences in a wide range of activities, including resource management planning, outreach to Tribes, and assessing how climate change will affect the people and

communities who use Arizona public lands.

BLM California

Example 1: Arcata: In FY 2014 the Arcata Field Office had proposed a prairie restoration project that included prescribed burning. Neighboring landowners expressed concerns during scoping and through comments on the Environmental Assessment. BLM staff engaged with concerned individuals through site visits and follow-up phone calls. This resulted in a greater understanding of the project by landowners and of neighboring landowners concerns by BLM staff. After the decision was signed one landowner filed an appeal which was withdrawn after conversations with neighbors.

Example 2: Bishop: Conservation of the Bi-State DPS of Greater Sage-Grouse is the objective of the Bi-State Local Area Working Group (LAWG), which includes representatives from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), US Forest Service (USFS), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW), Californian Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), Department of Defense (DOD), private property owners, and other key stakeholders such as Nevada Division of Forestry, California State Parks, University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, Nevada Wildlife Federation, US Geological Survey, Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada, and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. The LAWG has an Executive Oversight Committee (EOC) and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), including a Science Advisor from the U.S. Geological Survey. Accomplishments in FY 2014 included: an updated Action Plan with letters of commitment from the BLM Director and U.S. Forest Service and NRCS Chiefs to the USFWS Director, a Service First agreement, and an extensive data package to the USFWS for their consideration in determining whether listing of the Bi-State Sage-Grouse under the ESA is warranted. The dedication and cooperation of the LAWG has been extremely beneficial to the BLM and the other members, and more importantly to sage-grouse conservation in the Bi-State region. The accomplishments of the LAWG are gaining recognition as a model for future conservation efforts.

Example 3: Bishop: The Alabama Hills are a beautiful and unique part of the Eastern Sierra managed by the BLM as a Special Recreation Management Area. This area receives a high level of multiple uses by different recreationists. Local recreationists and business owners formed the Alabama Hills Stewardship Group to facilitate dialogue among users and to serve as a forum for collaboration. The mission of the Alabama Hills Stewardship Group is to promote conservation, use, enhancement, and enjoyment of the Alabama Hills' Special Recreation Management Area public land resources. The group includes representatives from the off-highway vehicle community, mountain bikers, rock climbers and professional guides, photographers, and equestrians along with local business owners, school teachers and the Lone Pine Paiute Shoshone Tribe. The diverse set of stakeholders engaged in the Alabama Hills

Stewardship Group has led to increased understanding between different types of public land users and greater consensus among the users on appropriate management actions by the BLM.

Example 4: Hollister: The Hollister Field Office and the California Coastal National Monument have added a citizen science program to their partnership. This citizen science program will monitor birds in the rocky intertidal areas along the coastline south of Monterey Bay. It continues research that has presently been performed by two interns for the past two years from Environment for the Americas. This program will expand the monitoring area, and use volunteers to increase our monitoring days. This data is fed to California Audubon Society.

Example 5: Redding Field Office: The BLM-Redding Field Office is an active member of the Trinity Collaborative, a group convened and led by the Trinity County Board of Supervisors for the purpose of finding cohesive and collaborative solutions and strategies for sound natural resource management in Trinity County, California. The Trinity Collaborative consists of Trinity County citizens, organizations, and businesses, as well as Federal, State, Tribal, and local government agencies. Through our participation in the Collaborative, BLM has benefited from increased public awareness of the BLM by achieving early, substantive public input into project efforts.

General participation in unassisted collaborative activities:

El Centro Field Office: The El Centro Field Office has participated as a cooperating agency with the Imperial County Planning Department on the Imperial County General Plan as it relates to public lands in general and the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan.

Mother Lode Field: The BLM Mother Lode Field Office's collaboration with Ducks Unlimited, the County of Sacramento, and other partners to prepare environmental documents for the Cougar wetlands restoration project involving BLM-administered land at the Cosumnes River Preserve in southern Sacramento County, CA.

BLM Colorado

Example 1: The BLM Grand Junction Field Office has partnered with five volunteers who assist in fertility control management within the Little Book Cliffs Wild Horse Range since 2002. The team has helped reduce population growth of the herd while maintaining genetic diversity. The volunteers have undergone extensive training required to perform remote field darting of selected mares. The volunteers also collect and maintain data that aides in selecting which mares should be treated and when. Their efforts have been recognized nationally as a model program for remote darting with PZP vaccine for population control.

Example 2: The Royal Gorge Field Office (RGFO) partners with multiple groups to protect paleontological resources through an education program that highlights the resources in the Garden Park Fossil Area (GPFA). The RGFO shows the public the significance of the irreplaceable paleontologic resources on public lands, since 50 percent of paleontology materials in museums today were found on public lands. The RGFO also created a presentation for the marsh Quarry Tour, and these materials are part of a curriculum local school teachers can use to help fulfill state Department of Education history and science requirements. The BLM's partners include the Fremont County Stones and Bones, Garden Park Paleontology Society, The National Park Service National Natural Landmark Program, the Geological Society of America's GeoCorps Program and many local volunteers. The RGFO's efforts have been funded by multiple programs including Hands on the Land, Take it Outside, and other Department of the Interior youth initiatives.

Example 3: The BLM recently acquired a 160-acre in holding parcel in the Dominguez-Escalante National Conservation Area that is jointly managed by the Grand Junction and Uncompahgre Field Offices. The Gibbler Gulch acquisition known as the American Mountain Men property brings the total acreage of the Dominguez-Escalante National Conservation Area to 210,149.36 acres. Funding for the purchase came from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Western Rivers Conservancy (a non-profit organization) helped to facilitate the acquisition. The property was completely surrounded by BLM and is now open for members of the public to enjoy.

General participation in unassisted collaborative activities: All BLM Colorado Field and District Offices, as well as the State Office and the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument participate in unassisted collaboration. This ranges from volunteer partnership work, to cooperating agencies in NEPA documents, to lively discussions of the Resource Advisory Councils. This participation also includes sitting on numerous committees and working groups throughout the state that address a myriad of land management challenges.

BLM Idaho

Example 1: Jarbidge Field Office: In the Jarbidge Field Office, Bruneau Overlook is a unique BLM managed area that overlooks the majestic Bruneau-Jarbidge River Wilderness. BLM recently received request from the public and special use groups to improve the facilities in this area, including making the overlook ADA compliant. As a result the Jarbidge Field Office worked collaboratively with various entities including, Boise District BLM, Shoshone Paiute Tribe, The Wilderness Society, Idaho Conservation League, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Owyhee County Commissioners, Owyhee County Sheriff, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, Idaho Department of Lands, and local livestock permittees. This collaborative group worked for months to develop a final site plan which will soon be implemented, resulting in improved facilities, like a vault toilet, new railing, parking area, developed trails

and overlook viewing areas that are ADA accessible while still maintaining the natural characteristics of the surrounding area and adjacent Wilderness.

Example 2: Upper Snake Field Office: In the Upper Snake Field Office, the Montevieu Canal Company (MCC) bladed an unauthorized road to access a water-well, damaging two archaeological sites, which constitutes an Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) violation. Representatives from the MCC were upset and contacted their congressional staff. MCC and the Idaho Upper Snake Field Office agreed to enter into a negotiated settlement. Several face-to-face meetings were held during which MCC explained their actions and BLM explained applicable laws. The parties agreed on a solution that would benefit cultural resources within the field office. MCC reclaimed the road and paid \$2,000 towards education/interpretive signs, which will be developed in coordination with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.

Example 3: Salmon Field Office: Upper Salmon Basin Watershed Project (USBWP) - has been the umbrella that coordinates the lead for more than a dozen local, state, federal and tribal participants and is responsible for the completion of over 250 projects, with an additional 300+ projects implemented through working closely with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) Fish Screen Program. The work in the upper Salmon Basin encompasses restoring flow in streams, including the Lemhi and Pahsimeroi Rivers and their tributaries for more than 100 miles of spawning and rearing habitat. Hundreds of irrigation diversions have been improved and screened. Collectively, this demonstrated large-scale fish habitat improvement while maintaining the important agricultural aspects of Lemhi and Custer Counties. The efforts of the USBWP on private land have helped BLM's efforts to improve aquatic habitat on upstream public lands for the overall improvement of resident and anadromous fish populations.

Example 4: Burley Field Office: The Burley Landscape Partnership, a collaborative group which consists of BLM, NRCS, IDFG, Pheasants Forever, Idaho Department of Lands and private land owners in the Burley Field Office, works collaboratively to accomplish landscape level juniper management, including treatments across multiple ownerships designed to improve rangeland health and sage grouse habitat. This group was recently awarded the BLMs Rangeland Stewardship Award.

Example 5: Coeur d'Alene Field Office: The Coeur d'Alene Basin Natural Resource Trustees (Trustees) are the U.S. Department of Interior (BLM and USFWS), U.S. Department of Agriculture (FS), Coeur d'Alene Tribe and State of Idaho. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and Clean Water Act (CWA) identify Federal, Tribal and State governments as trustees over natural resources on behalf of the public. The role of the Trustees is to return natural resources that have been harmed by mine-waste contamination to a healthy condition. The Trustees have chosen

to work together through the Trustee Council, which was developed through a 2012 Memorandum of Agreement. The Trustees launched the Restoration Partnership shortly thereafter to effectively engage the public in restoration efforts. The Restoration Partnership is currently developing a natural resource Restoration Plan (RP) for the Coeur d'Alene Basin.

Example 6: Cottonwood Field Office: There was an extensive collaboration effort by the Cottonwood Field Office and the Idaho State Office that went into the Riggins Dredge-In event. BLM collaborated with Congressional Offices, EPA, USFWS, NMFS, the Nez Perce Tribe, the Idaho County Commission, and the City of Riggins. This event occurred on the heels of the Bundy issue and could have easily turned into a similar event without this collaboration effort.

General participation in unassisted collaborative activities:

- Lemhi Forest Restoration Group
- Aspen Working Group
- Challis Sage-Grouse Local Working Group
- Shoshone Basin Local Working Group

BLM Montana-Dakotas

General participation in unassisted collaborative activities: The Montana-Dakotas District and Field Offices routinely work collaboratively with partners, other agencies, and the Resource Advisory Councils (RACs).

BLM New Mexico

Example 1: Restore New Mexico: BLM-New Mexico honored one rancher earlier this year with the "Restore New Mexico" award for leadership to improve range conditions on his ranch and public land near Carlsbad, New Mexico. In coordination with the BLM, the recipient began aerial herbicide treatments for invasive areas of mesquite and creosote on his allotment. Through his efforts and cooperation, and others like him, the upland watersheds within the community have benefited greatly from the improved grass community, the reduced soil erosion, and the improved water infiltration and retention. Restore New Mexico continues to be an ecosystem wide effort. Since 2005, participants in the Restore New Mexico initiative have treated over 3.2 million acres of public, State, and private land, making the Restore New Mexico initiative a model for rangeland conservation in the western United States. Over 300 partners have participated in Restore New Mexico including ranchers and other landowners, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, New Mexico State Land Office, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the New Mexico Association of Conservation Districts, several Soil and Water Conservation Districts, New Mexico State University, and the USFWS.

Example 2: Chaco Culture National Historical Park: The BLM New Mexico Farmington Field Office fostered a relationship with the National Park Service,

San Juan Citizens Alliance, Chaco Alliance, National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Hopi Tribe, and other groups to further determine how to best identify, define, and analyze a myriad of potential effects from potential oil and gas leasing and development near Chaco Culture National Historic Park. Through extensive outreach, the BLM encouraged dialogue and developed working relationships that facilitated candid discussion of important but complex natural resource management issues, including the need for balanced energy development. The BLM recognized the importance of the cultural resources associated with the park and the landscape that extends beyond the park, and, in consultation from its partners, has endeavored to ensure protection of these values consistent with valid existing rights and other law, regulation, and policy. The BLM anticipates finalizing a Memorandum of Understanding with the National Park Service in 2014.

Example 3: Potash Working Group: BLM New Mexico formulated a long-term strategy beginning in 2006 to establish an ongoing dialogue between oil and gas industry, potash industry and the BLM to promote concurrent, orderly, and safe development within the Secretary's Potash Areas. As part of this strategy, the BLM developed and funded a series of technical studies through a contract with Sandia National Laboratories (SNL) to study some issues contributing to a long-standing dispute between the oil and gas industry and potash industry. In 2014, the BLM continued its role as a broker between the two industries and utilized science-based decision making in an effort to resolve issues without creating political or legal battles. The BLM and its partners made great strides in executing the current Secretarial Order through drafting both regulations and an implementation strategy.

General participation in unassisted collaborative activities: BLM New Mexico has a long history of collaborating with communities and other partners to help manage public lands in a four-state area. Committed to promoting the stewardship of vigorous ecosystems and healthy communities in the present and for future generations, BLM involves the public as well as federal, state, tribal, and local governments and organizations in a collaborative decision making process. This allows the BLM-NM to manage its landscapes, integrate community and land management issues, and expand its capacity to create innovative solutions and build sustainable partnerships.

BLM Oregon/Washington

Example 1: In the Spokane District, the San Juan Islands National Monument held a public meeting to discuss and analyze public policy. The conversation included missing data of listed species, additional management plans and laws which apply to BLM landscapes, and suggestions for present day conflicts that could be addressed without changing the existing status (to be sustained through the RMP planning period). County commissioners were present at all three of these meetings, and thanked the BLM for a transparent, open processes.

Example 2: In 2013, Oregon Governor John Kitzhaber launched the Western Juniper Alliance (WJA), a collaborative effort managed by Sustainable Northwest. A BLM staff person serves as Chair of the WJA and infrequently provides meeting space. The goal of the WJA is to turn an ecosystem challenge – the spread of invasive Western Juniper – into an economic opportunity for eastern Oregon by expanding commercial markets for Western Juniper. Members of the WJA include government agencies at all levels, environmental and conservation groups, Western Juniper harvesters, ranchers, trade associations and private businesses. The WJA is working to grow the market for Western Juniper to sustain and cultivate new business opportunities by strengthening the Western Juniper supply chain. WJA also promotes training programs to build a qualified workforce, and make sure that small businesses have the financial resources they need to grow and create jobs in rural communities working collaboratively to connect economic opportunities to western juniper byproducts of Sage Grouse habitat restoration. One outcome of the WJA efforts was a completed interagency MOU between OR/WA BLM and Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region to ensure that agencies analyze juniper removal in NEPA documents that include juniper cutting and to confirm commitment from agencies to provide spatial juniper supply data at least annually. Another outcome was that the BLM increased the acres of juniper to be treated in the Burns District so a local contractor could also add capacity to his business. The local contractor ended up doubling his staff as a result.

Example 3: Oregon Sub-region Greater Sage-Grouse Resource Management Plan (RMP). The Oregon Sub-region's Greater Sage-Grouse Resource Management Planning effort, which is amending up to eight RMPs in eastern Oregon, routinely engaged Cooperating Agency stakeholders at the local, state and federal level without facilitator assistance. These meetings were critical in collaborating about key aspects of the drafting of the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement. The Oregon Sub-region's Greater Sage-Grouse Project Manager/Interdisciplinary Team Lead meets with the Cooperating Agency group on a monthly basis. There are five MOUs with counties, one with the Harney Soil and Water Conservation District, and national level MOUs with USFS, NRCS, and the USFWS. The Project Manager also convened an interagency team made up of the BLM, USFWS, NOAA-Fisheries, USFS (contracted to write the draft document), and EMPSI (sage-grouse contractor) to work on the biological assessment for the sage-grouse planning effort. The group met eight times and developed a product that is supported by all participants.

Example 4: The Southern Oregon Forest Restoration Collaborative (SOFRC) Medford District Office is working to develop strategies for maintaining and conserving northern spotted owl habitat while providing sustainable level of timber harvest. BLM and SOFRC meet monthly at regularly scheduled meetings to discuss this and other issues related to restoration and small

diameter challenges. SOFRC and the BLM (along with USFWS and FS) have developed a methodology to assess and prioritize treatments within the habitat of the northern spotted owl with the goal that most treatments will contribute toward the goal of O&C sustained yield timber management.

Example 5: The Applegate Neighborhood Network Medford District Office is working with a community group within the Nedsbar timber sale project area to design and develop a community alternative to be analyzed in detail. The BLM has been working with the Network, which represents a portion of the community concerned about the Nedsbar timber sale. The Network is also a major conduit for disseminating information about the project, as well as communicating concerns to BLM from the community. The timber sale is expected to be offered in September 2015. In early FY 2015, the Nedsbar timber project engaged a third party neutral to facilitate discussions in FY 2015 and additional information will be provided for the FY 2015 ECCR Report.

Example 6: In May 2014, the Mary's Peak Resource Area (Salem District) received two timber sale protests from Cascadia Wildlands, Oregon Wild, and Benton Forest Coalition. These protests were on the C-9 and Rickline Timber Sales, two forest management projects 10 miles west of Dallas, Oregon. The Mary's Peak staff engaged the protesters early to gauge interest in resolving the protests, which included numerous conversations and two site visits to the timber sales area. In July 2014, the BLM and the protesters resolved the protests. The BLM agreed to minor modifications to the timber sales and the protesters withdrew the protests. Resolving these protests allowed the timber sales to move forward while addressing some of the protesters concerns. The agreement helped avoid costly and time-consuming staff work associated with administrative appeals and potential litigation.

General participation in unassisted collaborative activities: Within the Salem District, Cascades Resource Area hosted an open house to present two future timber sales to interested members of the public and solicit their comments.

BLM Utah

Example 1: Uintah County Trail Concept Plan. The BLM Vernal Field Office collaborated with Uintah County, the City of Vernal, the National Park Service Rivers and Trails Assistance Program, and Utah State University to engage with community trail users and organizations and complete a countywide trails concept plan. Through a collaborative public process, the partners completed a plan that represents a consensus of the additional biking, hiking, and equestrian trails needed to connect local communities to their surrounding public lands. The concept plan also identifies additional key stakeholders to engage with and other local, state, and federal plans that will need to be considered for future trail development projects.

Example 2: Old Spanish Trail Iron County Recreation Development Strategy.

The BLM Cedar City Field Office collaborated with Iron County and its numerous local communities located along the Old Spanish National Historic Trail, as well as the Southern Utah Chapter of the Old Spanish Trail Association to complete a countywide strategy to promote heritage tourism associated with this congressionally-protected resource. Through a series of public open houses and field tours, the strategy identified recreational development needs and approaches that could be taken by private, state, and federal holders, including supporting recreation site designs. The Iron County Commission recently approved the implementation of the strategy, and additional community governments are expected to do the same shortly. The BLM Cedar City Field Office is currently developing both land use planning proposals and implementation-level site development efforts to support heritage tourism opportunities located on the public lands.

General participation in unassisted collaborative activities: BLM Utah regularly works with a wide variety of public land stakeholders regarding the implementation of its multiple-use mission without the use of third-party facilitators. These include collaborative activities associated with ongoing land use planning efforts in the Moab, Monticello, St. George, and Cedar City field offices; statewide land use planning efforts associated with the sage grouse amendment process; public engagement by each field office related to their various projects being proposed through the NEPA process which are all included on BLM-Utah's Environmental Notification Bulletin Board (<https://www.blm.gov/ut/enbb/index.php>); regular engagement with the BLM-Utah Resource Advisory Council and Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Advisory Council, tribal consultation regarding numerous projects and initiatives, and the development of numerous statewide MOUs and agreements with other government agencies, organizations, and individuals related to various aspects of the agency's multiple-use mission.

BLM Wyoming

Example 1: BLM Wyoming works collaboratively with multiple state agencies and Cooperating Agencies in collaborative management and dispute resolution. Currently BLM-Wyoming has achieved continued, successful dispute resolution through the Cooperating Agency processes. This process is ongoing in the Rock Springs (Rock Springs RMP Revision), Cody and Worland Field Offices (Bighorn Basin RMP revision), Buffalo Field Office (Buffalo RMP revision), and Lander Field Office (Lander RMP revision). BLM-Wyoming has also established Cooperating Agency MOUs with state and local agencies to support the Sage Grouse RMP Amendments, covering all six remaining field offices across the state. BLM-Wyoming has 17 ongoing EISs, which also are utilizing a collaborative approach involving stakeholders and Cooperating Agencies, as well as technical review committees, for specific issues such as Sage Grouse and air quality. Finally, BLM-Wyoming has established a close working relationship with the Resource Advisory Council to promote open and effective dispute resolution through established processes.

Example 2: The Deputy State Director, Resource Policy & Management continued to serve on the Governor's Sage Grouse Implementation Team in FY2014. This team oversees and addresses issues or conflicts related to implementation of the Governor's Executive Order 2011-05 "Core Area Management Strategy".

Example 3: In coordination and cooperation with the Wyoming Governor's Office, and State agency partners, BLM Wyoming entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding Cooperating Agency Status on all major Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) and complex Environmental Assessments. This includes the issuance of an Instruction Memorandum implementing this new policy.

NPS:

NPS Human-Wildlife Conflict Collaboration (HWCC).

The Natural Resource Stewardship and Science Human Dimensions Program continues to work with the Human-Wildlife Conflict Collaboration (HWCC) (www.humanwildlifeconflict.org) to integrate conservation conflict transformation (CCT), a sub-discipline of the peace building field, into conservation and protected area and wildlife management practices. In 2014, the Natural Resource Stewardship Training Program provided scholarships for four NPS staff to attend a four-day HWCC training on "Analyzing and Transforming Conflict to Create Sustainable Solutions for People and Wildlife." The course provided participants with the skills to analyze, anticipate, and address conflicts between people about how wildlife should be managed. Drawing on best practices from fields including conflict transformation, environmental dispute resolution, international peace building, and human dimensions of wildlife management, participants learned skills to recognize underlying drivers of conflict and design and implement a Conservation Conflict Intervention Plan (CCIP) individually tailored for their respective field site or other professional focus. NPS staff applied the concepts learned to design of public meetings for EIS processes, among other applications. HWCC and NPS also co-developed a distance-learning team training that will be piloted in FY 2015.

Examining Civic Engagement in the NPS.

A collaborative project between the NPS Office of Park Planning and Special Studies and the Natural Resource Stewardship and Science Directorate (EQD Social Science Branch, Planning & Compliance Branch and BRD Human Dimensions Program) was initiated to examine the current state of civic engagement for natural resource issues in the NPS. The role of civic engagement in the evolution of natural resource conservation and public participation was examined and champions for civic engagement and/or influence in the planning arena were interviewed. Interviewees noted that that pre-NEPA civic engagement can support NPS goals of reduced planning

timeframes, better community relations and other ways of “connecting people to parks.” Although DO-75A makes a clear distinction between civic engagement and public involvement in a NEPA process, this distinction is less clear in practice. In addition, while some resources are available, the project identified a need for consolidated resources that build capacity in how to design civic engagement processes, as well as specific guidance and examples for natural resources. Commitments were made to continue this effort in FY 15 as part of a broader strategy to institutionalize collaboration and alternative dispute resolution practices throughout the agency.

OSMRE:

OSMRE’s interaction with state and federal agencies to resolve developing conflicts or avoid potential conflicts embodies the principles of environmental conflict resolution and collaborative problem solving. OSMRE regional and field office managers recognized opportunities to engage with state and federal agency counterparts to better understand agencies’ missions and processes, and to coordinate those processes where possible to reach decisions based on shared data and analysis. Examples of recent collaborative problem solving efforts are identified below.

Permitting Decisions/Public Participation

Public participation is required for coal mine permit processing for new permits, significant permit revisions, and permit renewals. When an administratively complete application is received, the applicant must place an advertisement in a local newspaper of general circulation in the locality of the proposed coal mine as required by regulation. Public entities and any person having an interest which is, or may be, adversely affected may submit written comments or objections on permit applications. They may also request, in writing, an informal conference. The purpose of the public participation is to allow persons to let their comments and objections to the permits be known and to allow OSMRE to consider situations or views that may not have previously been considered before making its decision on the permit application. To ensure the participation of tribal members in the Southwest, OSMRE ensures that notification of all permitting actions and the opportunity to comment is done using radio announcements in either the Navajo or Hopi language. In addition, during all public meetings OSMRE ensures that the meetings are held in locations easily accessible to tribal members and that Navajo and Hopi translators are available to ensure that all questions from the public are understood and can be answered and that any comments the public may have are entered into the record. OSMRE also ensures that our tribal partners, as well as other Federal agencies, are full participants in these public meetings.

Also, during significant permitting actions OSMRE prepares the required NEPA documentation. As part of the NEPA process public participation is required. OSMRE again ensures full participation of tribal members by using the same approach and procedures used for our permitting public participation process.

OSMRE also works closely with the Tribes and other State and Federal bureaus to develop Programmatic Agreements under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This involves significant negotiation and collaboration with all parties to ensure the Programmatic Agreements meet all signatory parties' needs.

OSMRE has engaged in settlement negotiations with local citizen groups that have filed administrative or judicial complaints. These negotiations can result in the resolution of the complaint and win-win for both parties. OSMRE has also met with local citizen groups to discuss any concerns they may have with a Federal or State program. The goal of these discussions is to try to resolve any concerns the citizens may have before they result in administrative or judicial complaints.

State and Federal Team Evaluation of West Virginia Regulatory Program:

As a result of a petition filed by 18 environmental, civic, and religious groups to evaluate portions of West Virginia's administration of its approved permanent regulatory program, four evaluation teams comprised of both State and Federal employees were created to address the following topics: storm water runoff analysis procedures; topsoil protection, removal and redistribution procedures, including topsoil substitutes; operational and permit changes to correct water quality issues as identified by exceedances of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System effluent limitations, including selenium discharges; and cumulative hydrologic impact assessment procedures with an emphasis on the cumulative impact area and the identification and prevention of selenium discharges.

OSMRE established a Sharefile site where various documents could be electronically stored, shared, and viewed by the Petitioners, State and Federal managers, and State and Federal team members participating in the project. In addition, a Public Project Tracking System was launched so the Petitioners could view the progress of each evaluation topic. The Petitioners have reviewed and commented on the work plans for each topic and were provided review forms, report outlines, etc.

Team members are in the process of completing individual reports. Compilation of the team reports will commence in 2015, and final agency decisions are to be published in 2016.

Restoration of the Little Conemaugh River:

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection requested OSMRE to provide strategic, operational and technical assistance, training and mentoring in a cross-agency effort to restore the Little Conemaugh River to a level that could maintain aquatic life and afford recreational use. Various funding sources (restoration partners) were made available for this purpose

(government, non-government organizations, and private organizations.) The Little Conemaugh River watershed's economic and environmental wealth and potential has been adversely affected by coal mine drainage emanating from abandoned, historic mines. The goal is to restore the southwestern part of the watershed, covering 125 square miles.

OSMRE provided technical assistance by training new state technical personnel; developing a geo-referenced underground mine map system with locations of major water discharges and critical control points; as well as exploring strategic options for optimal mine drainage treatment. To support the restoration effort with sound science, OSMRE provided technical support through the mapping and attribution of abandoned underground mines, and chemical and physical hydrology analysis of mine-pools. Maps were secured from Federal, State, and private collections. To provide a sense of the magnitude of this effort, OSMRE received and analyzed over 320 individual mine map sheets, involving an area where more than 70 mines had operation. This effort was critical to ensure that the restoration partners understood the flow of the offending water to ensure that decisions were made on hard data and sound science.

Interagency Working Group Addressing Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) Responsibilities in Tennessee:

Beginning in 2010, OSMRE initiated a local inter-agency working group comprised of local agencies with duties related to implementing the SMCRA. The group works to reconcile outstanding issues affecting SMCRA, the Clean Water Act, and the ESA on SMCRA permits in the State of Tennessee. The group is comprised of representatives from OSMRE, the State of Tennessee, Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Protection Agency, and the USFWS. Through these meetings, contentious issues are resolved in a collaborative, more efficient, and timely manner.

Recently, the group utilized an attorney from the DOI Solicitor's Office to facilitate and provide guidance on legal issues related to a recent contentious SMCRA mine application and associated permit. The assistance centered on reconciling technical issues associated with implementing the ESA through the 1996 USFWS's Biological Opinion. When significant questions arose between OSMRE and the USFWS the attorney with the DOI Solicitor's Office helped the group arrive at a satisfactory solution for all involved while maintaining the intent and letter of applicable regulations. The issues were resolved in face-to-face meetings to identify outstanding issues, establish the applicable legal framework, and discuss potential solutions to the technical issues. Once the proper legal framework was settled, the group worked through the technical issues through a series of solicitor-mediated work products exchanged between OSMRE and the USFWS, providing for better, more informed, and defensible permitting decisions. This should serve to prevent possible future litigation and solidify a common position of the interested parties to the permitting actions.

8. **Comments and Suggestions re: Reporting:** Please comment on any difficulties you encountered in collecting these data and if and how you overcame them. Please provide suggestions for improving these questions in the future.

DOI bureaus had the following comments on the new ECCR template:

- The definition of ECCR should be revised to include and clarify that historic preservation and cultural resource questions or issues are explicitly included beyond the quoted memorandum citation below.
- Data and definitions of what constitutes ECCR were not consistently interpreted when seeking data or case studies. Some regions reported on activities that are likely similar to those carried out in other regions that were not reported. The term “environmental” was interpreted more narrowly in some offices than others, despite an explanation of what was being sought. Each year, we provide more detailed directions, but we continue to find the same confusion.
- Some don’t see that the collaborative activities that are undertaken on a routine basis as “ECCR,” so they may not have reported them. These are considered to be Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), so they are not routinely thought of.
- Some lack internal resources to collect and analyze the data and may not have provided a comprehensive report.
- Overcoming reporting difficulties has been a challenge and it is likely that there are some lower profile activities “out there” that may meet the strictest definition but which were not identified in this data call. Highlighting the ECCR success stories – more widely has helped to generate awareness of the types of activities that should be reported.