

Chapter 5 – Consultation and Coordination  
Response to Comments



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION IX  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

RECEIVED Point Reyes National Seashore
MAR 8 - '05
<i>[Signature]</i>
SUPT.
ASST. SUPT.
SPEC. PK. USES
LAW ENFORC.
PL. / SCIENCE
RANGE CONS.
FIRE MGT.
INTERP.
CULT. RES.
MAINT.
CONTRACTING
PERSONNEL
BUDGET
CENTRAL FILES

March 2, 2005

Don Neubacher, Superintendent  
Point Reyes National Seashore  
Point Reyes, CA 94956

Subject: Non-Native Deer Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)  
[CEQ # 050030]

Dear Mr. Neubacher:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above referenced document. Our review and comments are provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA Implementation Regulations at 40 CFR 1500-1508, and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The DEIS analyzes alternatives for management of Axis Deer and Fallow Deer in Point Reyes National Seashore (PRNS) and Golden Gate National Recreation Area lands administered by PRNS. The intent of the plan is to assist the National Park Service in restoring native ecosystems within park lands and preventing the spread of non-native deer into surrounding private and public lands, and to address impacts to agricultural permittees within PRNS. We have rated this DEIS as LO -- Lack of Objections (see enclosed "Summary of Rating Definitions").

We appreciate the opportunity to review this DEIS and request a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement when it is filed with our Washington, D.C. office. If you have any questions, please call me at (415) 972-3854, or have your staff call Jeanne Geselbracht at (415) 972-3853.

Sincerely,

Lisa B. Hanf, Manager  
Federal Activities Office

003944

Enclosure: "Summary of Rating Definitions"

Printed on Recycled Paper

## SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize EPA's level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the EIS.

### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

#### *"LO" (Lack of Objections)*

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

#### *"EC" (Environmental Concerns)*

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

#### *"EO" (Environmental Objections)*

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

#### *"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)*

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

### ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

#### *Category 1" (Adequate)*

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

#### *"Category 2" (Insufficient Information)*

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

#### *"Category 3" (Inadequate)*

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which should be analysed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

\*From EPA Manual 1640, "Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment."