Chapter 5
CONSULTATION/COORDINATION

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the consultation and coordination efforts that Camino Real Administration has carried out during preparation of this draft CMP/EIS for El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail. Work on this draft document began in 2001, following the directive from the Department of the Interior for BLM and NPS to jointly complete a management plan.

Consultation and coordination with federal, state, local, and tribal governments, and interested organizations and individuals (see Tables 13, 14, and 15), has occurred through formal and informal efforts. Although this public involvement is required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and the NPS act of August 25, 1916, both agencies have been placing increasing emphasis on involving communities in planning for the future of the national historic trail.

Consultation and coordination with federal, state, and local governments and non- government organizations in Mexico has occurred informally. A strategy to coordinate with Mexico has been developed jointly by the BLM and NPS, and will be implemented in cooperation with and through Mexico's Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH). INAH is the federal agency in Mexico responsible for cultural resource protection, and it has recognized the significance of the national historic trail in the U.S. and the importance of cooperating with the BLM and NPS. Meetings are planned with the state directors of INAH who have responsibility along El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro Trail in Mexico to discuss the strategy and coordination with Mexico. The BLM, NPS, and INAH have existing agreements that provide the three agencies with the authority to collaborate on this project. The act designating El Camino Real as a national historic trail states that the managing U.S. federal agency(s) will coordinate with Mexico.

FORMAL CONSULTATION

A biological evaluation was completed for this plan that made a "no effect" determination for listed threatened and endangered species. Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 is required before the BLM or NPS undertake an action that may affect, and is likely to adversely affect, any federal special- status wildlife or plant species or its designated habitat. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has agreed to enter into consultation again in pre- construction Environmental Assessments for specific projects.

CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER PLANS

BLM planning regulations require that Resource Management Plans (RMPs) be ". . . consistent with officially approved or adopted resource- related plans, and the policies and procedures contained therein, of other Federal agencies, North American Indian tribes, and State and local governments, so long as the guidance and management plans are also consistent with the purposes, policies and programs of Federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands. . . ." (43 CFR 1610.3- 2). NPS Management Policies (2001) for Park Planning call for cooperative regional planning and ecosystem planning whenever possible. To ensure such consistency, Camino Real Administration has sent letters to the federal, state, and tribal governments and local agencies listed in Table 11.

No inconsistencies are known to exist between the plan and officially approved and adopted

resource plans of these other entities. Camino Real Administration will continue coordination and consultation with federal, state, and local agencies and tribal governments.

Table 13: PARTIAL LIST STAKEHOLDERS/DOCUMENT RECIPIENTS

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

International Boundary and Water Commission
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Congressional Delegation
- Senator Jeff Bingaman, (D) NM
- Senator Pete V. Domenici, (R) NM
- Senator Phil Gramm, (R) TX
- Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, (R) TX
- Representative Joe Skeen, (R) 1, NM
- Representative Tom Udall, (D) 3, NM
- Representative Heather Wilson, (R) 2, NM
- Representative Silvestre Reyes, (D) 16, TX

U.S. Department of Agriculture
- Agriculture Experimental Station
- USDA Forest Service
- Natural Resources Conservation Service

U.S. Department of the Army
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Department of Defense
- White Sands Missile Range

U.S. Department of Transportation
- Federal Highway Administration

U.S. Department of Energy
- Los Alamos National Laboratory

U.S. Department of the Interior
- Environmental Policy and Compliance

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Regional Project Manager

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

STATE GOVERNMENTS

New Mexico

- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Economic Development
- Department of Game & Fish
- Department of Parks & Recreation
- Department of Tourism
- Environment Department
- Museum of New Mexico
- Office of Cultural Affairs
- Office of Indian Affairs
- Secretary of State
- State Energy & Resources Department
- State Highway & Transportation Department
- State Historic Preservation Officer
- State Land Commissioner
- State Records Center and Archives

Texas

- Department of Parks and Wildlife
- Department of Transportation
- Historical Commission
- State Historic Preservation Officer

New Mexico and Texas State Congressional Delegations
New Mexico and Texas State Governors' Offices

TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GOVERNMENTS

Acoma
All Indian Pueblo Council
Cochiti
Eight Northern Pueblo Indian Council
Five Sandoval Indian Pueblos
Fort Sill Apache
Hopi
Isleta
Jicarilla Apache
Laguna
Mescalero Apache
Nambe
Navajo Nation and
Ramah, Tohajiilee, and Alamo Chapters
Picuris
Pojoaque
San Felipe
San Ildefonso
San Juan
Sandia
Santa Ana
Santa Clara
Santo Domingo
Southern Ute
Taos
Tesuque
Tortugas
Ute Mountain Ute
Ysleta del Sur
Zia
Zuni

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

City Governments
City of Albuquerque, New Mexico
City of El Paso, Texas
City of Española, New Mexico
City of Santa Fe, New Mexico
City of Socorro, New Mexico
City of Truth or Consequences, New Mexico

County Commissioners/ Managers/Planning Offices

Doña Ana County, New Mexico
El Paso County, Texas
Río Arriba County, New Mexico
Sandoval County, New Mexico
Santa Fe County, New Mexico
Sierra County, New Mexico
Socorro County, New Mexico
Valencia County, New Mexico

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

El Paso Community College
New Mexico Institute of Mining and
  Technology – Socorro
New Mexico State University
Northern New Mexico Community College
Northwestern University – Evanston, Illinois
Santa Fe Community College
Southern Methodist University – Taos
University of California – San Diego
University of New Mexico – Albuquerque
University of Texas – El Paso
Center for Inter- American and Border Studies

NON-PROFIT AND PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS

El Camino Real International Center
Foundation

MEXICO

Municipalities
  San Francisco del Oro
  Santa Bárbara
  Valle de Allende
  Ciudad Chihuahua
State of Chihuahua
  Congreso de Chihuahua (State Legislature)
  Governor of Chihuahua
  External Affairs Director
  Minister of Education
  Outreach Director
University Autonoma of Chihuahua
Instituto Nacional de Antropología e
  Historia (INAH)
University of Chihuahua

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation in this planning effort is a continual process that occurs throughout the development of the plan, and beyond. In addition to formal public participation, informal contacts occur frequently with public land users and interested persons through meetings, field trips, telephone calls, and letters. All applicable public participation is currently documented, analyzed, and kept on file at the NPS Long Distance Trails Group Office in Santa Fe.

Camino Real Administration published a notice in the *Federal Register* on May 18, 2001 (Vol. 66, No. 97, pp. 27682- 4), announcing the formal start of this planning process.

The agencies held several meetings to determine the scope of the planning effort, develop planning issues, and review planning criteria (see Table 14). Prior to these meetings, a letter was sent to numerous individuals and groups, inviting them to participate by attending the meetings and/or providing written comments. Summaries of the scoping meetings were mailed to all individuals and organizations on the mailing list in October 2001. An update, *El Camino Real News*, was printed and mailed in January 2002.

Table 14: Public Meetings

Meeting/Group(s)	Location	Date
Scoping	Las Cruces, NM	June 13, 2001
Scoping	El Paso, TX	June 14, 2001
Scoping	Truth or Consequences, NM	June 18, 2001
Scoping	Socorro, NM	June 19, 2001
Scoping	Albuquerque, NM	June 22, 2001
Scoping	Alcalde, NM	June 25, 2001
Scoping	Santa Fe, NM	June 28, 2001
Community Design Session	Albuquerque, NM	August 22, 2001
Community Design Session	Espñola, NM	August 23, 2001
Community Design Session	El Paso, TM	September 19, 2001
Appreciative Inquiry Session	Sunland, NM	October 15, 2001
Appreciative Inquiry Session	Socorro, NM	October 16, 2001
Appreciative Inquiry Session	Albuquerque, NM	October 17, 2001
Appreciative Inquiry Session	Española, NM	October 20, 2001
Public Comment Meeting	Albuquerque, NM	November 6, 2002
Public Comment Meeting	Socorro, NM	November 7, 2002
Public Comment Meeting	Santa Fe, NM	November 8, 2002
Public Comment Meeting	Las Cruces, NM	November 21, 2002
Public Comment Meeting	El Paso, TX	November 22, 2002
Public Comment Meeting	Truth or Consequences, NM	December 5, 2002
Public Comment Meeting	Alcalde, NM	January 6, 2003

NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN CONSULTATION

Letters were sent to all of the North American Indian groups listed in Table 13 on May 18, 2001, asking them to meet with El Camino Real planning team and participate in the NHT planning process. Faxes were sent to all North American Indian groups in June 2001 to also invite them to the public scoping meetings. Letters were also sent in October 2001 inviting participation in the Appreciative Inquiry Sessions. Table 15 lists meetings with North American Indians that have occurred to date.

Table 15: North American Indian Meetings

Meeting/Group(s)	Location	Date
Ysleta del Sur Pueblo	Ysleta del sur Pueblo, TX	July 24, 2001
San Juan Pueblo	San Juan Pueblo, NM	August 15, 2001
Santa Domingo Pueblo	Santa Domingo Pueblo, NM	October 17, 2001
Pueblo of Sandia	Pueblo of Sandia, NM	October 23, 2001
Santa Clara Pueblo	Santa Clara Pueblo, NM	October 25, 2001
Laguna Pueblo	Laguna Pueblo, NM	January 29, 2003
Ysleta del Sur Pueblo	Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, TX	March 14, 2003

PREPARERS OF THE PLAN

This document was prepared by an interdisciplinary team of resource specialists from NPS and BLM. Table 16 lists the names and qualifications of the planning team members.

Table 16: List of Preparers

Name	Assignment	Education	Related Experience*
Robert Alexander	Vegetation/Weeds/Grazing (BLM-Santa Fe)	B.S., Range Science	BLM – 33 years
John Bristol	Visual Resources (BLM-Albuquerque)	B.S., Landscape Architecture	BLM/USFS – 30 years
Sharon A. Brown	Planning/Visitor Experience/Recreation (NPS-Santa Fe)	Ph.D., American Studies	NPS – 25 years
Charles Carroll	Planning/Environmental Planner	B.A., Anthropology	Environmental Science Private Industry – 8 years BLM – 21 years
Kevin Carson	Visual/Recreation Resources (BLM-Socorro)	B.S., Park Administration	BLM/NPS – 24 years
Bill Dalness	Energy/Minerals (BLM-Santa Fe)	M.S., Geology	BLM – 30 years
Joyce Fierro	International Grants and Partnerships coordinator, BLM, NMSO	International, Grants, Partnerships	BLM – 26 years
Oswaldo Gomez	Recreation/Visual Resources (BLM-Las Cruces)	B.S., Biology	BLM/NPS – 20 years
Jane Harvey	Writer-Editor (NPS-Santa Fe)	B.A., Anthropology	NPS – 24 years
Pamela Herrera Olivas	Wildlife/T&E (BLM-Santa Fe	M.S., Environmental Science	BLM – 6 years
Clarence Hougland	Lands and Realty (BLM-Santa Fe)	B.S., Recreation/ Land Management	BLM – 30 years
Terry A. Humphrey	Joint Team Leader (BLM-Santa Fe)	B.S., Recreation Management, Foresty	BLM/NPS/USFS – 22 years
Patricio R. Martinez	Geographic Information (BLM-Santa Fe)	GIS Specialist	BLM – 12 years

Table 16: List of Preparers continued			
Name	***Assignment***	***Education***	***Related Experience****
Harry Myers	Joint Team Leader (NPS-Santa Fe)	B.S., Recreation and Park Administration	NPS – 28 years
Ed Natay	American Indian Trust Responsibilities (NPS-Denver/Santa Fe, Intermountain Regional Office Staff)	American Indians Programs Administration/ Coordination	NPS – 30 years Indian Assistance/Tribal Liaison
Ramón R. Olivas	International Coordination (NPS-Las Cruces)	M.S., Wildlife Management	NPS – 18 years
John Roney	Cultural Resources (BLM-Albuquerque)	M.A., Anthropology	BLM – 24 years
Dave Ruppert	Ethnography (NSP-Denver)	Ph.D., Cultural Anthropology	BLM/OFI/NPS – 20 years
Joseph P. Sánchez	Spanish Colonial Research Center (NPS-Albuquerque)	Ph.D., History	University professor of history – 12 years NPS – 24 years
Sarah Schlanger	Joint Team Leader (BLM-Santa Fe)	Ph.D., Anthropology	University professor, Archeologist, Museum professional – 15 years BLM – 4 years
Pam Smith	Cultural Resources (BLM-Las Cruces)	B.S., Anthropology	BLM/USFS – 21 years
J. W. Whitney	Advisor (BLM-Santa Fe)	B.S., Botany	BLM – 34 years
Len Brooks	Advisor (BLM-Las Cruces)		
John Conoboy	Advisor (NPS-Santa Fe)		
Sam DesGeorges	Advisor (BLM-Taos)		
Lynn Engdahl	North American Indian Coordination (BLM-Washington		
Stephen Fosberg	Advisor (BLM-Santa Fe)		
Jon Hertz	Advisor (BLM-Socorro)		
Linda Ray	Visual Information Specialist (NPS-Denver)		
Angela West	Advisor (BLM-Washington)		
Mark Blakeslee	Advisor (BLM-Santa Fe)		

Note: Acronyms are as follows:
BLM – Bureau of Land Management
NPS – National Park Service
OFI – Office of the Federal Inspector
USFS – USDA Forest Service

The public comment period for the draft CMP/EIS ended on January 15, 2003. Comments were contributed by mail, by email through the website, www.elcaminoreal.org, and through a series of public meetings held between November 6, 2002, and January 6, 2003. During the comment period, 47 comments were received by letter or email; an additional four comments were received after January 15, 2003, but were accepted as late comments. Public meetings, consisting of a two- to- three- hour informational "open house," were held in seven communities in New Mexico and Texas, between November 6, 2002, and January 6, 2003. A total of 40 people attended these open house events.

During the comment period, Camino Real Administration received 10 additional requests for information about El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail, including requests for information on the auto tour route and the availability of classroom teaching resources. These requests are not included here as comments on the adequacy of the draft plan.

All letters and emails submitted through the mail or through the website, and all comments contributed during the open house events were reviewed and considered in preparation of the proposed Comprehensive Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Comments which addressed the adequacy of the draft CMP/EIS received a response. Comment contributors are listed in **Table 17 (Appendix J)**. Each commentor contributing a unique set of comments was assigned a unique comment number. Each comment may contain a number of salient points; these are identified through the assignment of subletter "a," "b," and so on. Eighteen identical comments were submitted by different individuals and combinations of individuals representing a number of small businesses and private concerns. In **Table 17 (Appendix J)**, these comments are given a single comment number, and each contributor is noted in the table.

Comment letters received from local, State, and other Federal agencies are printed here in their entirety. Copies of all comment letters and emails are available for viewing at the NPS Old Santa Fe Trail Building, Camino Real Administration Office, 1100 Old Santa Fe, Trail, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Commentors may track their comments by identifying their comment numbers, including subletters, in **Table 17 (Appendix J)**, and finding the appropriate comment and response in the text section following **Table 17 (Appendix J)**.

As noted previously, the Preferred Alternative presented in the draft has been brought forward, with minor modifications, as the Proposed Plan. We have continued to use the term "Preferred Alternative" in our responses here, as well as elsewhere in this document to stay as consistent with the language used in the draft as possible.