

V. CONSULTATION, COORDINATION, AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

This section describes the actions taken by the lead agencies to ensure full participation by the public, tribal governments, and other agencies in the development of the Draft Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP). The DRECP has also involved an extensive stakeholder participation process, which is also described in this section.

V.1 Public Scoping and Public Outreach

Under both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), “scoping” is a term used for the process of public involvement in determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action.

V.1.1 Scoping Process

NEPA Notices of Intent. Three Notices of Intent were issued for the preparation of this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS for a possible amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan in the Federal Register on November 20, 2009 (74 FR 60291). The Notice of Intent invited interested members of the public to provide comments on the CDCA issues and planning criteria related to the DRECP. Scoping ran from November 20, 2009 through December 21, 2009. No specific scoping comments were received during this 30-day period.

Subsequently, the BLM and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as co-lead agencies jointly published a Notice of Intent on July 29, 2011, (76 FR 45606) announcing their intent to prepare an EIS for the proposed DRECP. The USFWS expected the DRECP would be prepared to meet the requirements of the Section 10 Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)¹ permitting process under the federal Endangered Species Act. In this same NOI, the BLM announced the joining of its EIS preparation for the possible CDCA Plan amendment with the USFWS’s EIS for the DRECP HCP. The 2011 Notice of Intent provided dates and contact information for written comments on the scope of the EIS and published the dates, locations, and times for the public scoping meetings. Scoping meetings, receipt of comments, and the scoping report were merged with the CEQA Notice of Preparation process lead by the California Energy Commission.

¹ The July 29, 2011, Notice of Intent referred to the HCP permitting process. The USFWS had not at that time developed the proposed General Conservation Plan approach for nonfederal lands in the DRECP. A General Conservation Plan is a programmatic type of HCP that meets Section 10 requirements.

The BLM published a third Notice of Intent on April 4, 2012 (77 FR 20409), amending the Nov. 20, 2009 and July 29, 2011 notices to include proposed amendments to the Bishop, Caliente/Bakersfield, and Eastern San Diego County Resource Management Plans in preparation of the DRECP and EIS. Comments received during this scoping period, April 4 through May 4, 2012 are not included in the scoping report for the July 29, 2011 scoping period, but are part of the entire scoping administrative record and were considered during preparation of the DRECP and EIS.

CEQA Notice of Preparation. Pursuant to CEQA, a Notice of Preparation for the joint EIR/EIS was submitted to the State Clearinghouse (Governor's Office of Planning and Research) and distributed to state agencies on July 29, 2011. The Notice of Preparation was distributed to elected officials, local and regional agencies, utility companies, Native American tribal representatives, the Department of Defense clearinghouse, selected Department of Defense representatives, and representatives of interest groups and associations. The Notice of Preparation announced the intent of the California Energy Commission (CEC) and the NEPA co-lead agencies (BLM and USFWS) to prepare the EIR/EIS for the DRECP. It provided dates and contact information for written comments on the scope of the EIR/EIS and the dates, locations, and times for the public scoping meetings.

The Renewable Energy Action Team (REAT) Agencies distributed a news release, dated July 28, 2011, to announce the beginning of the scoping process and the date, time, and location of three public scoping meetings. The news release was posted on the DRECP website (www.drecp.org) and distributed to numerous news outlets.

Scoping Meetings. Three public scoping meetings were conducted for the EIR/EIS: one on August 16, 2011, in Ontario, California, and two on August 24, 2011, in Sacramento, California. In addition to attending the meeting in person, people could attend via the Internet or by telephone.

Each meeting began with a presentation followed by an open house during which attendees could discuss the plan and EIR/EIS with agency representatives. The presentation included an explanation of the DRECP process, the California Desert Conservation Area and other BLM planning actions, and CEQA/NEPA and the scoping process. The open house included information stations with agency and consultant staff available to answer questions.

Comment forms were made available at each scoping meeting and on the DRECP website. Written comments were accepted at each scoping meeting, as well as by mail and email. In total, 59 people attended the public scoping meetings: 46 in Ontario, 12 in Sacramento (afternoon), and one in Sacramento (evening).

Scoping Report. A Scoping Report was prepared for the DRECP (see Appendix J). It documents the process and issues raised during the public scoping period, as required by the Council on Environmental Quality’s NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1501.7); the BLM Handbook, H-1790-1, Chapters 6.3, 9.1.3, and 10.2.10; the USFWS Manual, Part 550, Chapter 2.3 (550 FW 2.3); and Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines. The DRECP Scoping Report is the primary source for the summary of the scoping process presented in this volume.

V.1.2 Scoping Issues Raised by Commenters

Forty letters were received during the 2011 scoping period: eight letters from agencies, 23 from organizations, and nine from individuals. These letters included 325 discrete comments. Table V-1 identifies the number of comments by CEQA/NEPA process or environmental issue category.

**Table V-1
DRECP EIR/EIS Public Scoping Comments by Category**

Comment Category	Number Received	Percentage
Biological Resources	60	18.5
Alternatives and Distributed Generation	44	13.5
Outdoor Recreation	44	13.5
Project Description	42	12.9
Planned Land Uses and Policies	30	9.2
Environmental Impacts and Mitigation	21	6.5
Cumulative	14	4.3
CEQA/NEPA Process	12	3.7
Cultural Resources ¹	12	3.7
Groundwater, Water Supply, and Water Quality	12	3.7
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases	11	3.4
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice	7	2.2
Flood Hazard, Hydrology, and Drainage	4	1.2
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	4	1.2
Public Services, Safety Services, and Utilities	3	0.9
Air Quality and Attainment Status	2	0.6
Geology, Soils, and Minerals	2	0.6
EIR/EIS Format	1	0.3
Total	325	100

¹ Cultural Resources comments included comments on tribal interests and tribal consultation.

V.1.3 Consideration of Scoping Comments and Other Input Received

The lead agencies considered the scoping comments in developing the alternatives and analytical issues contained in the EIR/EIS; all comments received equal consideration.

Throughout the planning phase of the DRECP, agencies and stakeholders have suggested and refined a number of reserve design and renewable energy development alternatives. Additionally, alternatives were identified during the public scoping process that occurred between July 29 and Sept. 12, 2011. The purpose of the public scoping period was to accept written comments providing suggestions and information on the scope of issues and alternatives to be addressed in the EIR/EIS. The REAT Agencies received 40 scoping letters, and 41 specific comments addressed alternatives. Several comments also addressed the geographic boundary of the Plan Area. The scoping comments are summarized in the DRECP Scoping Report (Appendix J).

Some of the suggested alternatives in the DRECP Scoping Report and from other agency and stakeholder comments were generally incorporated into the alternatives considered in Volume II of this document. Additionally, recommendations for plan development and EIR/EIS review were for the most part incorporated into the process. Some alternatives suggested by public comments were not described in sufficient detail to be considered or were outside the scope of the DRECP. Examples include:

- An energy-efficiency-only alternative
- An alternative that would incorporate more of San Diego County in the Plan Area
- An alternative that would include renewable energy development on military lands

Recommendations that the Plan Area exclude the region that overlaps the California condor range and critical habitat were considered but not carried forward (see Volume II, Chapter 7, for more detail).

V.1.4 Additional Opportunities for Public Comment

Since the close of the scoping periods, additional comments have been received and are available on the DRECP website, <http://www.drecp.org/documents/docs/comments-general>. These comments were also reviewed and considered in developing the EIR/EIS.

Since the close of the scoping periods, the agencies offered many other opportunities for public involvement throughout the process of preparing the DRECP. The DRECP project website (<http://www.drecp.org/>) was made available to the public to provide access to relevant project information and the opportunity to subscribe to the DRECP's email list for the project updates. Several key elements of the DRECP were also made available through

the project website. These include background materials and presentations from the stakeholder meetings, comments received on the stakeholder meetings, science reviews, the baseline biological report, preliminary conservation strategy, independent science advisors documents, and general background information about the DRECP.

V.2 Stakeholder Involvement

In March 2009, the REAT Agencies held scoping meetings on renewable energy and the implementation of Renewable Energy Executive Order S-14-08. These meetings were open to the public to provide input to the agencies on review and regulatory processes related to the siting of renewable energy infrastructure.

From June 2009 through 2013, the REAT Agencies held a series of public meetings to discuss the development of the DRECP. The meetings highlighted topics of special interest on which the REAT Agencies requested feedback. Comments on these topics were provided either in writing or verbally at the meetings. The meetings introduced some DRECP products in draft form with opportunities for written input. Table V-2 (presented at the end of this volume) lists the public meetings held and topics discussed.

As part of the meetings, the DRECP Stakeholder Committee was established. The Stakeholder Committee was composed of individuals from local governments, environmental organizations, electric utilities, renewable energy industry associations, renewable energy project developers, a coalition of Native American tribes, and off-highway vehicle associations. Federal and state agencies also participated in Stakeholder Committee meetings. A complete list of the Stakeholder Committee members is provided in Appendix A. Several topic-specific working groups within the Stakeholder Committee were formed to focus on the following areas: Covered Species, Resource Mapping, Covered Activities, and Transmission. While the Stakeholder Committee held some of the meetings in Table V-2, the general public was also invited to those. Additionally, the general public was offered opportunities to comment, make verbal comments during the meetings, submit written comments on these meetings, and can be found on the website at: <http://www.drecp.org/meetings/>.

In December 2012, the REAT Agencies published the *Description and Comparative Evaluation of Draft DRECP Alternatives* to inform the public about the status of the DRECP alternatives. Members of the public were invited to provide input regarding the development scenarios, reserve designs, BLM Land Use Plan Amendment alternatives, as well as other specific elements presented. The public was especially encouraged to provide input about the differences among the alternatives.

Forty agencies, organizations, and individuals provided comments on this document, some providing multiple comments. In addition, three form letters were received, one regarding

the Lucerne Valley and Apple Valley areas (more than 60 comments received), one regarding the Morongo Basin communities, (almost 200 comments received) and one regarding the Silurian Valley (20 comments received).

Example concerns raised include:

- Specific concerns regarding the alternatives described in the document including the need for additional wind areas,
- Concerns regarding locations that were designated as reserve areas,
- Requests for clear reserve designs based on Biological Goals and Objectives,
- Concerns regarding availability of water for the development of renewable energy in the desert and concerns regarding cumulative groundwater pumping,
- Need for additional streamlining including meaningful permitting reduction timeframes,
- Concerns regarding conservation costs, and
- Need for a transmission plan to serve DFAs, among others.

This input was used to help select the alternatives included in the EIR/EIS.

V.3 Additional Outreach During EIR/EIS Preparation

V.3.1 Agency and Public Workshops

Since the initiation of the DRECP, the REAT Agencies have been invited to a number of public workshops to provide information and status updates regarding the DRECP process to the interested public and agencies. Examples of the workshops include county meetings in Independence, Inyo County; Lucerne Valley and Yucca Valley, San Bernardino County; the BLM California Desert District Advisory Council, and the California Off Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Commission.

V.3.2 Data Basin Geographic Information System Tool

Data Basin (<http://www.drecp.databasin.org>) is a map-based, user-friendly conservation data sharing system, designed and maintained by the Conservation Biology Institute (CBI), to support conservation decision making. Concurrent with the public workshops described previously, and to continue to facilitate public coordination on the DRECP, the REAT Agencies established a customized data viewing gateway for the DRECP on the DataBasin website at, (<http://www.drecp.databasin.org>). The DRECP Gateway on Data Basin allows individuals and organizations — including the DRECP stakeholders, local agencies, tribes, and the public — to explore and download the library of spatially explicit DRECP

conservation datasets for the DRECP Plan Area, and to view and print selected data maps related to DRECP Planning.

V.4 Government-to-Government Consultation

Government-to-government consultation with Native American tribes is a cornerstone of effective communication, coordination, and collaboration among federal, state, and tribal governments. Federal policy, including BLM and USFWS policy, contains with instructions on how to conduct government-to-government consultation. The California state government has also engaged in government-to-government consultation with tribes. One important distinction between the federal and state consultation procedures is that in most cases the federal government only consults on a government-to-government basis with federally recognized tribes. Federal agencies can conduct outreach with unrecognized tribes as interested parties under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). California state government consults equally with federally recognized and unrecognized tribes. The following section describes state and federal government efforts to conduct government-to-government consultations with tribal governments. BLM and USFWS consultation with the tribes is ongoing and will continue throughout the process of developing and implementing the DRECP.

V.4.1 Federal Outreach

BLM California, USFWS Region 8, and the Department of Interior have conducted numerous meetings and technical sessions with Native American tribes. BLM California initiated government-to-government meetings creating a series of opportunities and a forum for the 40 federally recognized tribes in the California desert area to engage with federal executives through the Tribal Federal Leadership Conferences. The conferences were set up to identify issues, concerns, and interests and to share information regarding any and all resources in the California desert area pertinent to renewable energy, natural and cultural resource conservation, and land use planning as part of the development of the DRECP, including alternatives. The areas discussed were the California Desert Conservation Area, Bishop Resource Management Plan, Caliente/Bakersfield Resource Management Plan, and Eastern San Diego County Resource Management Plan.

Through the conferences, the Department of the Interior and the BLM, with the USFWS and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, specifically solicited and facilitated tribal input in to renewable energy and land use planning. Meetings were held:

- September 21, 2011
- November 11, 2011
- November 16, 2011
- February 16, 2012

- April 4, 2012
- July 18, 2012
- December 12, 2012
- February 4, 2014

The meeting held on February 4, 2014 included the participation of the California Resources Agency, CEC and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Other federal outreach has included pre-meetings, numerous technical meetings, and individual meetings with the 40 federally recognized tribes. The conference also provided information, maps, technical assistance, presentations, access to executive-level federal management, and other specialized services. The conference goals were to solicit tribal input for the DRECP and incorporate tribal concerns into future development planning in the Plan Area. Appendix V.1, Table 1, lists the dates and methods of government-to-government communications through October 2013.

The BLM and USFWS consult with Indian tribes on a government-to-government basis in accordance with several authorities including NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, the NHPA, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and Executive Order 13175. Native American tribal consultations are being conducted in accordance with policy, and tribal concerns will be given due consideration. At this point, the BLM has met face-to-face with most of the federally recognized tribes under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (Sec. 202[c] 9) and others. The BLM has also contacted other potential consulting parties. Outreach has led to the exchange of information and discussion of concerns that have shaped the development of the DRECP. The USFWS will consult with tribes on three major issues: (1) government-to-government consultation on the proposed General Conservation Plan (GCP) (nonfederal lands only), (2) NHPA section 106 consultation for the GCP (nonfederal lands only), and (3) government-to-government consultation, and NHPA section 106 consultation, for permits issued under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (Eagle Act; 74 FR 46836 and 78 FR 73704) (BLM lands only; for nonfederal lands, eagles will be a Covered Species under the GCP and incidental take permits will be issued under the GCP). Consultation among the BLM, USFWS, tribes, and other consulting parties will continue throughout all phases of DRECP development.

V.4.2 BLM Section 106 Consultation

With respect to planning for public involvement in the Section 106 process, the November 20, 2009, Notice of Intent published in the Federal Register for the DRECP stated that the BLM would use and coordinate the NEPA commenting process to satisfy the public involvement process for Section 106 of the NHPA as provided for in 36 CFR 800.2(d)(3). The BLM now plans to use the NEPA commenting process to supplement public involvement efforts required for Section 106. Under Section 106 of the NHPA, the BLM consults with Indian tribes as part of its responsibilities to identify, evaluate, and resolve

adverse effects on historic properties affected by BLM undertakings. To date, the BLM has invited federally recognized Indian tribes to consult on the DRECP on a government-to-government basis through formal letters and face-to-face meetings. Letters from the BLM were sent in December 2013 requesting assistance in identifying sacred sites and places of traditional religious and cultural significance that may be within the BLM's Area of Potential Effect and seeking input regarding knowledge of or concerns with historic properties that may be affected by BLM's Land Use Plan Amendments.

Meetings between BLM Field Managers and tribes typically covered a range of topics including the development of the DRECP (Appendix V.1, Table 1). Significant Indian tribe outreach for the DRECP has also occurred at the staff level. The contact at the staff level is not formal consultation, but it fosters a detailed dialogue regarding the BLM's proposal to amend land use plans and is critical to the planning process. The technical information sharing provides much of the basis for conducting meaningful consultation between decision makers. The BLM's effort to engage in meaningful Section 106 consultation with Indian tribes and other consulting parties will proceed throughout all phases of development and implementation of any Land Use Plan Amendment associated with the DRECP.

The BLM initiated consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Officer on Nov. 16, 2012, regarding the BLM's Section 106 responsibilities triggered by the proposal to adopt a Land Use Plan Amendment as an aspect of the multi-agency DRECP. The consultation to date has focused on the BLM's Section 106 responsibilities with regard to the DRECP and what the BLM is doing to meet those responsibilities. Discussions continue regarding:

- Consulting parties
- Interested parties
- Tribes
- Identification and evaluation of historic properties (at an overview level)
- Assessment of effects of the decisions to identify Development Focus Areas, Conservation and Management Actions, right-of-way exclusion zones, corridors, etc.
- The utility and suitability of developing a new renewable energy plan amendments for the DRECP (that may or may not retain the solar plan amendments)

On January 14, 2013, the SHPO provided written comments on the Description and Comparative Evaluation of Draft DRECP Alternatives distributed in December 2012. The BLM's consultation with the SHPO is not complete but will be done by the time the Record of Decision is signed.

On September 13, 2011, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation notified the USFWS to offer its assistance and to state its interest in participating in the DRECP process as appropriate. The BLM formally notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on June 18, 2012, regarding its involvement in the DRECP. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation confirmed to the BLM on June 29, 2012, it was interested in participating. The BLM notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on August 9, 2013, that the agency was proposing to enter into a Programmatic Agreement pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b) to fulfill its Section 106 obligations associated with the proposed Land Use Plan Amendment. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation confirmed on October 22, 2013, that it is participating in the process. The BLM's consultation to date has focused on its Section 106 responsibilities with regard to the DRECP and what the BLM is doing to meet those responsibilities. Discussions continue regarding:

- Consulting parties
- Interested parties
- Tribes
- Identification and evaluation of historic properties (at an overview level)
- Assessment of effects of the decisions to identify Development Focus Areas, Conservation and Management Actions, right-of-way exclusion zones, corridors, etc.
- The utility and suitability of developing a new renewable energy plan amendments for the DRECP (that may or may not retain the solar plan amendments)

The BLM's consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is not complete but will be done by the time the Record of Decision is signed.

V.4.3 USFWS Section 106 Consultation

The USFWS's issuance of Endangered Species Act section 10(a)(1)(B) incidental take permits for activities covered in an HCP constitutes an undertaking under Section 106 of the NHPA. Section 106 requires the USFWS to take into account the effects of its undertakings on historic properties and make a good-faith effort to incorporate these considerations into project planning.

The USFWS's NHPA section 106 consultation with SHPO and tribes will consider the impacts to cultural resources that could result from USFWS's authorization of incidental take of Covered Species. USFWS defines the APEs for the GCP as the site-specific locations where the activities that would result in incidental take would occur on the ground, and where any historic properties may be affected by the proposed undertaking (i.e., incidental take authorization). For the GCP, the APE would be all non-Federal lands within the DFAs

that are open to project applicants for ground disturbance associated with renewable energy development, areas where permittee mitigation lands would be managed by the DRECP Coordination Group, and areas where permittee non-acquisition measures may be implemented. USFWS expects to develop a Programmatic Agreement with the SHPO as part of NHPA section 106 consultation for the GCP. The Programmatic Agreement will establish the conditions permit applicants will be required to implement to assess the potential effects on historic resources that would result from site-specific projects, and to mitigate any adverse effects.

In addition, before issuing a permit under the Eagle Act for unintentional take of golden eagles, the USFWS will consult with Native American tribes if issuance of the permit may affect traditional tribal activities, practices, or beliefs. The USFWS will also consult with appropriate tribes on permit applications under the GCP for which golden eagles are considered a Covered Species to determine whether the tribes have concerns about historic properties of religious and cultural significance in areas of these federal undertakings.

The USFWS considers the joint BLM-USFWS Tribal Leadership Meetings described previously as part of ongoing government-to-government communication and coordination with tribes under the Endangered Species Act. The USFWS will conduct ongoing meetings, in some cases jointly with the BLM, with individual tribes to initiate NHPA section 106 consultation for the GCP and to initiate government-to-government and section 106 consultation on Eagle Act permits.

V.4.4 State Consultation

The Governor's Executive Order B-10-11, executed on September 19, 2011, directs state agencies to engage in meaningful consultation with California Indian tribes on matters that may affect tribal communities. The California Resources Agency adopted a Final Tribal Consultation Policy on November 20, 2012. The recently adopted policy extols informed decision making by collaboratively working with tribes to seek positive, achievable, and durable outcomes. The California Resources Agency expects departments and commissions under its umbrella, including the CEC, to develop tribal consultation policies that cover the unique missions of the departments and commissions. The CEC is in the process of developing a tribal consultation policy.

The Native American Heritage Commission is the primary California government agency responsible for identifying and cataloging Native American cultural resources, providing protection to Native American human burials and skeletal remains from vandalism and inadvertent destruction, and preventing irreparable damage to designated sacred sites and interference with the expression of Native American religion in California. It also provides a legal means by which Native American descendants can make known their concerns

regarding the need for sensitive treatment and disposition of Native American burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials.

The Native American Heritage Commission maintains a database to assist government agencies in identifying tribal governments that have concerns with areas proposed for projects, planning, or other actions. Their tribal government contacts database has the names of and contact information for individuals representing tribal groups who have expressed an interest in being contacted about development projects or plans in specified areas.

CEC staff contacted the Native American Heritage Commission on November 21, 2013, and requested a Native American contacts list for the tribal governments with cultural affiliation to the areas within the DRECP boundaries. The Native American Heritage Commission responded on Nov. 21, 2013, with a list of Native Americans interested in consulting on development projects or planning efforts in the DRECP boundaries. This list contained federally recognized tribes and unrecognized tribes. CEC staff provided the Native American Heritage Commission-listed tribes to the BLM, which coordinated the tribal notification efforts inviting tribes to attend the Seventh DRECP Tribal Leadership Meeting held in Palm Springs on Feb. 4, 2014. The USFWS and CEC attended and made presentations at the meeting.

Consultation between the CEC and tribes and other consulting parties will continue to take place throughout the process of developing and implementing the DRECP.

V.5 Agency Cooperation, Consultation, and Coordination

Under NEPA, a “cooperating agency” includes any federal agency, other than a lead agency, that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed project or project alternative (40 CFR 1508.5). A similar concept under CEQA includes “responsible agencies,” meaning a public agency, other than the lead agency, that has responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.

CEQA Responsible agencies for the DRECP include:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- California State Lands Commission

NEPA Cooperating agencies for the DRECP include

- National Park Service
- Department of Defense
- California Independent System Operator

In addition to these formal cooperating and responsible agencies, the REAT Agencies have consulted with the following local agencies throughout the Plan Area: the City of Lancaster, the Town of Apple Valley; and Imperial, Riverside, San Bernardino, Kern, Inyo, Los Angeles, and San Diego counties. While no city or county is currently an applicant for federal or state take authorizations, the town of Apple Valley and San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Inyo, and Imperial counties signed Memoranda of Understanding regarding participation and engagement in the development of the DRECP.

The DRECP has been developed so that other nonfederal applicants — including counties, cities, and individual renewable energy developers — may later join the GCP component of the DRECP by utilizing information in the DRECP to submit incidental take permit applications consistent with the GCP through a streamlined permitting process.

In accordance with the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA, the REAT Agencies have coordinated with the SHPO throughout the preparation of the DRECP EIR/EIS.

**Table V-2
DRECP Meetings***

Date	Meeting Title and Topics
March 12 and 17, 2009	Implementing the Renewable Energy Executive Order: Facilitating Renewable Energy Development and Natural Resource Conservation Planning
June 18, 2009	Implementation of the DRECP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project • Coordination and Participation • Renewable Energy in California: Implementing the Governor’s Renewable Energy Executive Order
October 13, 2009	Draft Best Management Practices and Guidance Manual: Desert Renewable Energy Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best Management Practices and Guidance Manual: Desert Renewable Energy Projects • Desert Tortoise Survey Protocols • Solar Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement • Burrowing Owl and Mohave Ground Squirrel Survey Protocols
March 23, 2010	Stakeholder Meeting – Riverside <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRECP First Stakeholder Committee Meeting • Independent Science Advisory Process for DRECP

**Table V-2
DRECP Meetings***

Date	Meeting Title and Topics
April 22, 2010	Independent Science Advisors Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use and Renewables in the Desert • Considerations for the DRECP • Investor-Owned Utilities Stakeholder Discussion • Providing Scientific Information and Analyses to help inform the DRECP and promote protection of desert biodiversity • Comments to the DRECP Science Advisors • Independent Science Advisory Process for DRECP • Renewable Energy in California: Implementing the Governor’s Renewable Energy Executive Order • Concentrating Solar Power
May 27, 2010	Stakeholder Advisory Meeting – Sacramento <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coachella Valley Multiple Species HCP/National Community Conservation Plan • East Contra Costa County HCP/National Community Conservation Plan • Independent Science Advisory Process for DRECP
June 9, 2010	Stakeholder Advisory Meeting – Sacramento <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRECP Interim Project Process
July 14, 2010	Stakeholder Meeting – Victorville <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acres & Watts: Considering Scale & Renewable Energy • Implementing Senate Bill X8 34 (2010): Efficient Implementation of Biological Mitigation Measures for American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Projects
August 11, 2010	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 2010 Update: Independent Science Advisory Process for DRECP
September 8, 2010	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving Forward with DRECP Conservation • Independent Science Advisors Report • Addressing DRECP Mapping Needs
October 13, 2010	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Interior Initiatives • Rapid Ecoregional Assessment • Solar Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Update • Landscape Conservation Cooperative • An Ecoregional Assessment of the Mojave Desert
November 17, 2010	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Message From the Office of the Secretary • Natural Communities, Covered Species, and Covered Activities Preliminary Description • Interim National Community Conservation Plan/HCP Process • Other Environmental and Public Health/Safety Issues Preliminary Description

**Table V-2
DRECP Meetings***

Date	Meeting Title and Topics
January 12–13, 2011	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRECP Plan Area Boundary Considerations • Framework Conservation Strategy Progress • DRECP Regulatory Framework
January 27, 2011	Public Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative Biological Impacts Framework • Mohave Ground Squirrel • Mapping Habitat Distributions of Desert Rare Plants • Population Viability and Restoration Potential for Rare Plants Near Solar Installations • Desert Tortoise Spatial Decision Support System • Desert Tortoises Habitat Suitability Models and Head-Start Techniques to Minimize Conflicts
February 16, 2011	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Renewable Portfolio Standard Calculator • Local Government Outreach Update
March 9, 2011	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Group Reports – Covered Activities, Covered Species, Resource Mapping, Cultural Resources • Other Nonbiological Issues Preliminary Description • Gap Analysis Tutorial • Biological Goals and Objectives Tutorial
April 13, 2011	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Group Reports – Covered Activities, Covered Species, Resource Mapping, Cultural Resources • DRECP Framework Conservation Strategy – Outline and Schedule • DRECP Effects Analysis and Species Modeling Approach Tutorials
May 17–18, 2011	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of Renewable Energy Needed in the DRECP Planning Area • Future Field Visit(s) to Potential Development Areas • Long-term Monitoring Project by BLM and the Department of Energy • Case Studies Of Possible Permitting Scenarios With and Without the DRECP National Community Conservation Plan/HCP
June 16-17, 2011	Field Visit Tour Potential Renewable Energy Development Areas
July 13, 2011	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRECP Renewable Energy Calculator and the Amount of Renewable Energy That May Be Needed in the DRECP Planning Area • Progress Report on Preliminary Conservation Strategy • Covered Species Tutorial
July 20, 2011	Field Visit Tour Potential Renewable Energy Development Areas

**Table V-2
DRECP Meetings***

Date	Meeting Title and Topics
August 17, 2011	Public Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRECP Renewable Energy Calculator Update • Modeling of Effects and Mitigation Analyses for Solar Development and the Mojave Desert Tortoise • Update on Mohave Ground Squirrel Field Studies • Electric Transmission Line Permitting
October 12, 2011	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable Energy Transmission Interconnection Potential • DRECP Renewable Energy Calculator And Development Planning • Draft Preliminary Conservation Strategy Maps and Methods/Approaches • Progress Report On Local Government Outreach • DRECP Tribal Summit Report • DRECP National Community Conservation Plan/HCP Alternatives
October 21, 2011	Field Visit Tour Potential Renewable Energy Development Areas
November 9, 2011	Stakeholder Committee Meeting –WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Update • DRECP Development Planning Update • Geothermal Energy Potential and Permitting • Overview and Summary of the DRECP Preliminary Conservation Strategy Report And Associated Maps
November 21, 2011	Joint Working Group Meeting – WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRECP Transmission Planning and Permitting
November 28, 2011	Joint Working Group Meeting – WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind and Solar Industry Presentations
December 5, 2011	Joint Working Group Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2040 and 2050 Acreage Needs for Renewable Generation • Renewable Portfolio Standard and Acreage Calculator
December 14–15, 2011	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRECP Goals and Objectives • Transmission Planning Panel • Breakout Sessions: Industry and Utilities, Land Use, Natural Resources, and Outdoor Recreation
January 18, 2012	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Sacramento <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transmission Planning Update • Overarching DRECP Planning Goals • Biological Goals and Objectives
February 9–10, 2012	Transmission Technical Group Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imperial Irrigation District Transmission Plan Input • Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Transmission Plan Input • Potential PG&E Northern California Transmission Additions • Southern California Edison Transmission Line Components

**Table V-2
DRECP Meetings***

Date	Meeting Title and Topics
February 15, 2012	Phasing Proposal Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRECP Phasing Non-Governmental Organizations • Presentation on CEC Staff Forecast Model for DRECP • Analysis of the CEC-DRECP Spreadsheet Model and Scenarios
February 17, 2012	Transmission Technical Group Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Transmission Plan • Southern California Edison Potential Transmission Corridors and Draft Transmission Plan
February 24, 2012	Stakeholder Working Session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marxan and Post-Marxan Analysis
March 14, 2012	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Sacramento <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CalWEA Refined Wind Energy Proposal • Renewable Energy Assumptions (Acres and Megawatts) for DRECP • Transmission Planning Update and Discussion
March 28, 2012	Biological Goals and Objectives Workshop – Sacramento <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual Model Approach, Draft Plan-Wide Biological Goals and Objectives, and Integration With Reserve Design • Biological Goals and Objectives Development, Report, and Next Steps
April 25–26, 2012	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Defense Operations in California Deserts • Electric Transmission Planning Overview and Update • Renewable Energy Policy Context and DRECP Energy Goals • Preliminary Plan-Wide Biological Reserve Design and Renewable Energy Development Scenarios • Breakout Sessions: DRECP Scenarios as Seen Through (1) Conceptual Electric Transmission Planning; (2) Preliminary Biological Goals and Objectives and Reserve Design; (3) Land Uses; (4) Renewable Energy Development Scenarios
May 16, 2012	Technical Workshop – Sacramento <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRECP Climate Change, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management
June 21, 2012	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western Mojave Least Environmental Conflict Assessment
June 26, 2012	Independent Science Panel Public Meeting – Riverside <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reserve Design • Climate Change Adaptation • Species Distribution Modeling • Monitoring and Adaptive Management • Conservation Planning Process
Jul 13, 2012	Energy Roundtable Discussion – Sacramento <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic Value of Variable Generation • Energy and Infrastructure Implications of the DRECP • Geothermal Development • Renewable Electricity Futures

**Table V-2
DRECP Meetings***

Date	Meeting Title and Topics
July 25–26, 2012	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Ontario <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview and Discussion of DRECP Alternatives • Department of Defense Analysis of DRECP Alternatives • Discussion With David J. Hayes, Deputy Secretary of the Interior
September 5, 2012	Technical Group Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable Energy Gigawatt-Hour Calculation • California Department of Defense Facilities’ Renewable Generation • Development Focus Areas and Alternatives • Transmission Plan Development
September 24, 2012	Public Workshop – Sacramento <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Principles for a Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan
January 9, 2013	Public Meeting – Sacramento <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and Comparative Evaluation of Draft DRECP Alternatives • Overview of the Transmission Technical Group’s Transmission Report • Incorporating Ongoing Science and Biological Information into the DRECP • Golden Eagle Framework
October 18, 2013	Staff Meeting – WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of DRECP Gateway Powered by Data Basin • Conservation Elements – Species • Terrestrial Landscape Intactness • Integrating Biological Goals and Objectives and Conservation and Management Actions • Climate Change – Futures, Refugia, and Velocity
November 21, 2013	Staff Meeting – WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of DRECP Gateway Powered by Data Basin • Draft Covered Species Models • Datasets for Linkages, Connectivity, and Land Cover • Terrestrial Intactness and its Logic Model
January 23, 2014	WebEx <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial Landscape Intactness and Logic Modeling Software

* Presentations and meeting materials are available at: <http://www.drecp.org/meetings/>.