

---

# Chapter 5



---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
<b>5.</b>	<b>CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION .....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	5-1
5.2	Collaboration.....	5-1
5.2.1	Native American Tribe Consultation.....	5-2
5.2.2	Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer Consultation .....	5-2
5.2.3	US Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation .....	5-3
5.2.4	Resource Advisory Council Collaboration.....	5-3
5.2.5	Community Assessment .....	5-3
5.2.6	Recreation Planning Report .....	5-3
5.2.7	Wild and Scenic Rivers Public Input Process .....	5-4
5.3	Cooperating Agencies .....	5-5
5.4	Coordination and Consistency.....	5-6
5.5	Public Involvement.....	5-8
5.5.1	Scoping Process.....	5-9
5.5.2	Travel Management Scoping Process .....	5-10
5.5.3	Project Website .....	5-11
5.5.4	Mailing List.....	5-11
5.5.5	Notice of Availability of the Draft RMP/EIS .....	5-11
5.5.6	Future Public Involvement.....	5-12
5.5.7	Public Meetings.....	5-12
5.5.8	Distribution and Availability of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS .....	5-12
5.6	Summary of Comments Received on the Draft RMP/EIS .....	5-13
5.6.1	Process and Methodology .....	5-13
5.6.2	Summary of Written Comments Received.....	5-13
5.7	List of Preparers.....	5-16

---

## TABLES

		Page
5-1	Cooperating Agencies .....	5-6
5-2	Scoping Open House Information .....	5-10
5-3	Draft RMP/EIS Open House Information.....	5-12
5-4	Summary of Substantive Comments Received on Draft RMP/EIS .....	5-14
5-5	Number of Substantive Submissions by Commenter Affiliation .....	5-15

This page intentionally left blank.

# CHAPTER 5

## CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the public outreach and participation opportunities made available through the development of this RMP/EIS and consultation and coordination efforts with tribes, government agencies, and other stakeholders. This chapter also lists the agencies, organizations, and individuals that received a copy of the draft RMP and associated EIS.

The BLM land use planning activities are conducted in accordance with NEPA requirements, Council on Environmental Quality regulations, and US DOI and BLM policies and procedures implementing NEPA. The NEPA and associated laws, regulations, and policies require the BLM to seek public involvement early in, and throughout, the planning process to develop a reasonable range of alternatives to proposed actions and to prepare environmental documents that disclose the potential impacts of proposed actions and alternatives. Public involvement and agency consultation and coordination, which have been at the heart of the planning process leading to this RMP/EIS, were achieved through Federal Register notices, public and informal meetings, individual contacts, media releases, planning bulletins, and the GJFO RMP revision website (<http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/gjfo/rmp.html>).

### 5.2 COLLABORATION

Federal laws require the BLM to consult with certain federal and state agencies and entities and Native American tribes (40 CFR 1502.25) during the NEPA decision-making process. The BLM is also directed to integrate NEPA requirements with other environmental review and consultation requirements to reduce paperwork and delays (40 CFR 1500.4-5).

In addition to formal scoping (**Section 5.5.1**, Scoping Process), as summarized below, the BLM has implemented an extensive collaborative outreach and public involvement process that has included conducting a community assessment,

coordinating with cooperating agencies, and working closely with the Colorado Norwest RAC and a specially created subcommittee of the RAC. The BLM will continue to meet with interested agencies and organizations throughout the planning process, as appropriate, and will continue coordinating closely with cooperating partners.

### **5.2.1 Native American Tribe Consultation**

The BLM began tribal consultation for cultural resources for the planning process through a Ute Ethnohistory Project, which involved three BLM field offices—Grand Junction, Uncompahgre, and Colorado River Valley—that are currently revising RMPs. Presentations were held for Tribal Councils in February, May, and August 2007, and letters of invitation were mailed to tribal cultural department staff in September 2007. Cultural representatives from the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation (Ute Indian Tribe), Southern Ute Tribe, and Ute Mountain Ute Tribe attended a two-day meeting in Gateway, Colorado, in November 2007, and another meeting in Grand Junction, Colorado, in March 2008. The GJFO staff held tours to significant Ute sites in the GJFO decision area from September 9 through 11, 2008, with cultural department staff and traditional leaders from the Ute Indian Tribe and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe. This was followed by a meeting between the GJFO Field Manager, RMP Project Manager, BLM cultural staff, and the cultural staff and traditional leaders from the Ute Indian Tribe and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe on September 11, 2008, to discuss the RMP process and their involvement.

On August 30, 2010, the GJFO sent letters to 14 tribal governments (other than the three Ute tribes), to assess their interest in participating the RMP process. None of the 14 tribes expressed interested in participating.

Additional meetings to share progress on the RMP were held with the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe cultural staff in early 2011, with the Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Council March 13, 2012; with the Southern Ute Indian Tribal Council on July 22, 2011; and with the Ute Indian Tribe, Uintah and Ouray Reservation Business Committee on August 15, 2011.

No written comments were received from tribal agencies during the scoping period; tribal concerns or issues have been typically presented in oral format. Government-to-government consultation has continued throughout the RMP process to ensure that tribal groups' concerns are considered during RMP development.

An internal review version of the draft RMP/EIS was provided to the three tribes, and the draft RMP/EIS was provided to the three tribes concurrently with its release to the public.

### **5.2.2 Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer Consultation**

The Draft RMP/EIS was provided to the SHPO in January 2013. The BLM is currently consulting with the SHPO regarding areas proposed as Open to cross-

country travel for all modes of travel. Consultation on the travel management plan (Appendix M) is ongoing. Additional information on SHPO consultation will be added to the Approved RMP and Record of Decision.

### **5.2.3 US Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation**

To comply with Section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the BLM consulted USFWS early in the planning process. USFWS provided input on planning issues, data collection and review, and alternatives development. The BLM has consulted with USFWS to develop the draft Biological Assessment, which was formally submitted to the USFWS on October 3, 2014. Copies of the Biological Assessment and the USFWS's Biological Opinion will be provided as appendices to the Approved RMP/Record of Decision.

### **5.2.4 Resource Advisory Council Collaboration**

A RAC is a committee established by the Secretary of the Interior to provide advice or recommendations to BLM management (BLM Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601-1). A RAC is generally composed of 15 members of the public representing different areas of expertise. The Colorado Northwest RAC includes members appointed to represent constituent public land users and provides input on public management issues to the BLM's Northwest RAC Designated Federal Officers. Recommendations are based on consensus-building and collaboration.

The Colorado Northwest RAC was involved in developing the preliminary planning issues for the GJFO RMP. In addition, a RAC subcommittee was established to participate in the planning process, and in particular to assist the BLM with creating a range of reasonable alternatives for the EIS. To date, 17 meetings of the RAC subcommittee have been held at the GJFO. On November 3, 2011 the RAC subcommittee approved the range of alternatives as a reasonable range, at the next Northwest RAC meeting (December 1, 2011) the RAC disbanded the subcommittee because their task was fulfilled.

### **5.2.5 Community Assessment**

Colorado Mesa University, in cooperation with the GJFO, facilitated 11 focus groups with community leaders and residents living in the GJFO planning area. The purpose of the focus groups, conducted between February 23 and April 22, 2009, was to ascertain what participants value about the communities they live in and the surrounding public lands; their concerns in achieving their community and public lands vision; the beneficial outcomes their visions would produce; the perceived impacts BLM decisions would have on their visions; and the appropriate role of collaborating partners in planning and managing public lands. These data have been used in the RMP/EIS preparation.

### **5.2.6 Recreation Planning Report**

Colorado Mesa University prepared a Recreation Planning Report to provide GJFO with data on recreation user and user group preferences, trends, and concerns. Thirteen focus group meetings were held in summer 2009 with non-

motorized users, motorized recreation enthusiasts, hunters, and local service providers. Information derived from these meetings was compiled into the Recreation Planning Report and used during draft RMP/EIS preparation.

Collaboration with various entities will be necessary to successfully implement and monitor recreation management actions under the approved RMP. The GJFO will continue working with groups such as the Colorado Plateau Mountain Bike Trail Association, Colorado Off-highway Vehicle Coalition, Old Spanish Trail Association, and others. Area tourism promotional organizations such as the Grand Junction Convention and Visitors Bureau, City of Grand Junction, City of Fruita, Gateway Canyons Resort, Palisade Chamber of Commerce, and City of Palisade and Downtown Development Authority, gear retailers, and other recreation-tourism service providers all provided input during draft RMP/EIS preparation and/or will be collaboratively engaged in RMP implementation.

### **5.2.7 Wild and Scenic Rivers Public Input Process**

#### ***Eligibility Phase***

As detailed in **Appendix C**, public involvement for the GJFO WSR evaluation process began during the eligibility phase as part of initial scoping for the RMP from October 15, 2008 through January 9, 2009. Public outreach during the scoping period included: 1) a newsletter mailed to over 600 agency officials, organizations, and members of the public; 2) three scoping open houses in December 2008 in Grand Junction and Collbran, Colorado, and in Moab, Utah; and 3) a public website, <http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/gjfo/rmp>, which provides access to materials distributed at scoping meetings, as well as information on the public involvement process. The BLM presented the results of its initial identification efforts, provided educational materials regarding the WSR process, and solicited comments from the public and government agencies.

The public was invited to submit comments via US mail, facsimile, and/or electronic mail and comments were accepted until January 9, 2009. The BLM received 36 discreet comments in seven letters related to WSR during scoping. Comments were analyzed and incorporated as appropriate into the eligibility study. More detailed information on public involvement during the eligibility phase can be found in the Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Report for Bureau of Land Management, Grand Junction Field Office (BLM 2009a) and the Resource Management Plan Revision Scoping Summary Report (BLM 2009b).

#### ***Suitability Phase***

In late-March of 2009, the suitability phase of the evaluation process began. Letters were mailed to potential stakeholders, seeking information on the eligible river segments. Stakeholders were specifically asked to provide data related to the suitability criteria. Letters to potential stakeholders were sent on March 31, 2009, and included a list of the suitability criteria, a question and

answer on WSRs analysis and water rights/water projects overview, and a WSRs guide for riverfront property owners. Data received were analyzed and incorporated into the suitability evaluation.

During stakeholder outreach for suitability, the BLM received 23 comment letters. Comments pertained to a range of topics from the eligibility of certain segments to opinions on the suitability of eligible segments. As intended, the stakeholders provided valuable information related to the suitability criteria which was incorporated into the evaluation when applicable.

A stakeholder group, named the Lower Colorado River Wild and Scenic Stakeholder Collaborative, formed independently of BLM's public outreach process. This stakeholder group included representatives from state government, local governments, conservation districts, water districts, organizations representing agricultural interests, and organizations representing environmental interests. The stakeholder group also included several private landowners. The objective adopted by the group was to provide collaboratively-developed management recommendations to the BLM that would support the identified outstandingly remarkable values on specific stream segments while also supporting stakeholder uses and values that exist along certain stream segments. At the request of the group, BLM provided information concerning the WSR Act, the BLM planning process, and stream-related natural resource values. The BLM did not participate in the group as a stakeholder, nor did BLM participate in decisions made by the group concerning management recommendations. The group sent a letter signed by all the parties conveying its recommendations to BLM. This letter is incorporated as part of the public comment record for the BLM planning effort. Stakeholder group recommendations are more fully discussed in **Appendix C**.

### 5.3 COOPERATING AGENCIES

A cooperating agency is any federal, state, or local government agency or Indian tribe that enters into a formal agreement with the lead federal agency to help develop an environmental analysis. More specifically, cooperating agencies “work with the BLM, sharing knowledge and resources, to achieve desired outcomes for public lands and communities within statutory and regulatory frameworks” (BLM Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601-1).

On April 8, 2008, the BLM wrote to 20 local, state, federal, and tribal representatives, inviting them to participate as cooperating agencies for the GJFO RMP. Twelve agencies agreed to participate in the RMP as designated cooperating agencies, eight of which signed MOUs with the GJFO. On February 4, 2013 Garfield County sent a letter to the GJFO requesting cooperating agency status. On March 11, 2013 Garfield County became the ninth cooperating agency to sign an MOU with the GJFO (**Table 5-1**, Cooperating Agencies). No formal MOUs have been established with cooperating agencies within the DOI, including US BOR and USFWS.

**Table 5-1  
Cooperating Agencies**

<b>Agencies and Tribes Invited to be Cooperators</b>	<b>Agencies that Accepted</b>	<b>Agencies that Signed MOUs</b>
City of Delta		
City of Fruita	X	X
City of Grand Junction	X	X
Town of Collbran	X	X
Town of De Beque	X	X
Town of Palisade	X	X
Delta County		
Garfield County	X	X
Mesa County	X	X
Montrose County		
Colorado Department of Natural Resources	X	
Colorado Parks and Wildlife	X	
Colorado River Water Conservation District	X	X
DOI Bureau of Reclamation	X	
DOI Fish and Wildlife Service	X	
USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service		
USDA Forest Service	X	X
Ute Indian Tribe, Uintah and Ouray Reservation		
Southern Ute Indian Tribe		
Ute Mountain Ute Indian Tribe		

Starting on August 18, 2008, the BLM has conducted 22 meetings to date with cooperating agencies. Cooperating agencies were also encouraged to attend the scoping open houses and provide comments during the scoping period (**Section 5.5.1**, Scoping Process). These agencies have been engaged throughout the planning process, including during alternatives development. Cooperating agencies were invited to attend route designation meetings for the Draft RMP/EIS and for the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. In addition, BLM offered to meet with each cooperating agency individually to review the Draft RMP/EIS and answer any questions. Future cooperating agency meeting dates will be posted on the GJFO RMP revision website (<http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/gjfo/rmp.html>).

#### **5.4 COORDINATION AND CONSISTENCY**

The BLM's planning regulations (43 CFR 1610) require that its RMPs be consistent with officially approved or adopted resource-related plans of other federal, state, local, and tribal governments, to the extent that those plans are consistent with federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands. Plans formulated by federal, state, local, and tribal governments that relate to

management of lands and resources have been reviewed and considered as the RMP/EIS has been developed. These plans include the following:

#### **City and County Plans**

- Garfield County Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan (Garfield County 2013)
- City of Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan (City of Grand Junction 2009)
- Fruita Community Plan (City of Fruita 2008)
- Town of Palisade Comprehensive Plan (Town of Palisade 2007)
- Community growth and development plans
- Mesa County Noxious Weed Management Plan (Mesa County 2009a)
- Mesa County Master Plan, as amended (Mesa County 1996)
- Mesa County Mineral and Energy Resources Master Plan (Mesa County 2011)

#### **State Agency Plans**

- Colorado River Cutthroat Trout Conservation Agreement (CPW 2006b)
- Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission's regulatory rules
- Gunnison Sage-grouse Conservation Plan, Piñon Mesa, Colorado (Piñon Mesa Gunnison Sage Grouse Partnership 2000)
- Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Steering Committee 2005)
- Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats (Connelly et al. 2004)
- Colorado Sagebrush: A Conservation Assessment and Strategy (Boyle and Reeder 2005)
- Colorado's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (CPW 2006)
- Parachute-Piceance-Roan Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan (Parachute-Piceance-Roan Greater Sage-grouse Work Group 2008)

#### **Other Federal Agency Plans**

##### *US Fish and Wildlife Service, Colorado*

- ES/GJ-6-CO-08-F-0010 Programmatic Biological Opinion for Water Depletions associated with Bureau of Land Management Projects

(excluding Fluid Mineral Development) Authorized by BLM within the Upper Colorado River Basin in Colorado

- ES/GJ-6-CO-08-F-0006 Programmatic Biological Opinion for Water Depletions Associated with Bureau of Land Management's Fluid Mineral Program within the Upper Colorado River Basin in Colorado

#### *US Forest Service*

- Noxious and Invasive Weed Management Plan for Oil and Gas Operators (US Forest Service and BLM 2007)
- US Forest Service Roadless Inventory and associated EIS (US Forest Service 2001)
- White River National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (US Forest Service 2002)
- Planning Rule for Land Management Planning for the National Forest System (US Forest Service 2012).
- White River National Forest Oil and Gas Leasing EIS (in progress)

#### *Neighboring BLM Offices*

- Northwest Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Draft Resource Management Amendment and EIS (in progress)
- Colorado Division of Wildlife (now Colorado Parks and Wildlife [CPW]) Strategic Plan 2010-2020 (CPW 2009a).
- Colorado River Valley Field Office RMP revision (in progress)
- Dominguez-Escalante National Conservation Area RMP (in progress)
- McInnis Canyons National Conservation Area (BLM 2004e)
- Moab Field Office RMP (BLM 2008e)
- Uncompahgre Field Office RMP revision (in progress)
- White River Field Office RMP revision (BLM 1997c)
- White River Field Office Oil and Gas RMP amendment (in progress)

## **5.5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

Public involvement is a vital and legal component of both the RMP and EIS processes. Public involvement vests the public in the decision-making process and allows for full environmental disclosure. Guidance for implementing public involvement under NEPA is codified in 40 CFR Section 1506.6, thereby ensuring that federal agencies make a diligent effort to involve the public in the NEPA process. Section 202 of the FLPMA directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish procedures for public involvement during land use planning actions on public lands. These procedures can be found in the BLM's Land Use Planning

Handbook (H-1601-1). Public involvement for the GJFO RMP/EIS includes the following four phases:

- Public scoping before NEPA analysis begins to determine the scope of issues and alternatives to be addressed in the RMP/EIS;
- Public outreach via newsletters and news releases;
- Collaboration with federal, state, local, and tribal governments, the BLM Colorado Northwest RAC, and cooperating agencies; and
- Public review of and comment on the draft RMP/EIS, which analyzes likely environmental effects and identifies the BLM's preferred alternative.

The public scoping phase of the process has been completed and is described in **Section 5.5.1, Scoping Process**. The public outreach and collaboration phases are ongoing throughout the RMP/EIS process. Information about the process can be obtained by the public at any time on the GJFO RMP revision website (<http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/gjfo/rmp.html>). This website contains background information about the project, a public involvement timeline and calendar, maps and photos of the planning area, and copies of public information documents released throughout the RMP/EIS process.

#### **5.5.1 Scoping Process**

The formal public scoping process for the GJFO RMP/EIS began on October 15, 2008, with the publication of the NOI in the Federal Register (Vol. 73, No. 200, page 61164). The NOI notified the public of the BLM's intent to develop an RMP for the GJFO; it also initiated the public scoping period, which closed on January 9, 2009.

##### **News Release**

A news release was provided to local news organizations on November 6, 2008. This press release announced the scoping period for the GJFO RMP/EIS process and provided information about the open houses.

##### **Newsletter**

On November 11, 2008, the BLM mailed a newsletter announcing the start of the scoping period for the GJFO RMP/EIS to more than 680 individuals from the public, agencies, and organizations who had participated in past GJFO BLM activities and had been included on past BLM distribution lists. The newsletter provided the dates and venues for three scoping open houses, included a comment form for submitting scoping comments, and described the various methods for submitting comments, including dedicated email and postal addresses. The BLM published additional newsletters at major project milestones and mailed them to individuals and organizations that requested to remain on or be added to the project mailing list. These newsletters are posted

on the GJFO RMP revision website (<http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/gjfo/rmp.html>).

### **Scoping Open Houses**

The BLM hosted three open houses to provide the public with opportunities to become involved, learn about the project and the planning process, meet the GJFO RMP team members, and offer written comments. The public was notified of the open houses by news release and in the project newsletter. Information on the open houses is provided in **Table 5-2**, Scoping Open House Information.

**Table 5-2**  
**Scoping Open House Information**

<b>Venue</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Number of Attendees</b>
Two Rivers Convention Center	Grand Junction, Colorado	December 2, 2008	99
Grand Center	Moab, Utah	December 3, 2008	2
Collbran Auditorium	Collbran, Colorado	December 4, 2008	13
		<b>Total</b>	<b>114</b>

Note: All meetings were from 5:30 to 7:00 pm.

Scoping meetings were held in an open house format to encourage participants to discuss concerns and questions with BLM staff representatives. The BLM gave a short presentation to provide an overview of the RMP process and present information about public involvement opportunities. Site and resource maps illustrated the current situation and management techniques practiced among different resources and land areas. In addition, summaries of resource issues were available to provide an overview of current management practices and issues. Copies of the project newsletter and scoping comment forms were available. A total of 114 people attended the open houses.

### **Scoping Comments Received**

The BLM received 149 unique written submissions containing 953 separate comments during the public scoping period. Detailed information about the comments received and about the public outreach process can be found in the Grand Junction Field Office RMP Revision Scoping Summary Report, finalized in April 2009 (BLM 2009a). The issues identified during public scoping and outreach helped refine the list of planning issues, included in **Section 1.6.2**, Issue Identification, which guided the development of alternative management strategies for the RMP.

### **5.5.2 Travel Management Scoping Process**

To aid in the route designation process, GJFO also hosted a series of “travel management data collection workshops” in February 2009 to give the public the opportunity to review its route inventory for completeness and accuracy, as well as offer suggestions for possible reroutes or new routes that would

complement the existing system. The workshops were held in Delta, DeBeque, Collbran, Gateway, Fruita, and Grand Junction, with over 200 participants. A total of 118 written comments were received during this comment period.

From the input received at the travel management data collection workshops, GJFO identified the need and interest from the public to comment not only on the completeness and accuracy of the inventory but also to help evaluate the quantity and quality of the experiences and desired recreation setting available in the planning area. A second comment period was held, wherein the GJFO received 178 written comments. Viewpoints expressed in the comments reflected a wide spectrum of desires regarding appropriate levels of access. See **Appendix L**, Draft Travel Management Plan for the Grand Junction Field Office, for a full description of the travel management public involvement process.

### 5.5.3 Project Website

The BLM maintains an interactive website to provide the public with the latest information about the RMP/EIS process. The website, available on the Internet at <http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/gjfo/rmp.html>, provides background information about the project, a public involvement timeline and calendar, maps and photos of the planning area, and copies of public information documents such as the NOI and newsletter. The site also provided a link to the comment form for submitting scoping comments.

### 5.5.4 Mailing List

The BLM compiled a mailing list of over 680 individuals, agencies, and organizations that had participated in past BLM projects. Each entity was mailed or emailed the initial newsletter with project and scoping open house information. Attendees at the scoping open houses were added to the mailing list if they wanted to receive or continue to receive project information. In addition, all individuals or organizations who submitted scoping comments were added to the mailing list. Through this process, the mailing list was revised to include approximately 960 entries. Requests to be added to or to remain on the official GJFO RMP distribution list will continue to be accepted throughout the planning process.

### 5.5.5 Notice of Availability of the Draft RMP/EIS

On January 25, 2013, the BLM and EPA published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register which marked the beginning of the formal 90-day public comment period. On March 6, 2013 the public comment period was extended 60 days. The formal public comment period ended on June 24, 2013.

The BLM provided paper copies of the Draft RMP/EIS directly to cooperating agencies, other federal, state, and local agencies, and tribal representatives. Paper copies were also available at community libraries in Grand Junction, Collbran, DeBeque, Gateway, and Fruita.

### 5.5.6 Future Public Involvement

The ROD will be issued by the BLM after the release of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, the Governor's Consistency Review, and any resolution of protests received on the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Section 5.5.8 describes the protest period.

### 5.5.7 Public Meetings

Five open houses were held during the 150-day comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS (See **Table 5-3**, Draft RMP/EIS Open House Information). The locations, dates, and times of the open houses were announced via email and in the RMP newsletter that was sent to over 1,400 people included on the mailing list. Press releases in local and regional newspapers and radio spots supplemented the mailing. In addition, the locations, dates, and times of the open houses were posted on the GJFO RMP website.

**Table 5-3**  
**Draft RMP/EIS Open House Information**

Venue	Location	Date	Number of Attendees
Collbran Auditorium	Collbran, Colorado	January 29, 2013	7
DeBeque Community Center	DeBeque, Colorado	January 30, 2013	29
Clarion Inn	Grand Junction, Colorado	January 31, 2013	245
Gateway Community Center	Gateway, Colorado	February 5, 2013	46
Fruita Civic Center	Fruita, Colorado	February 7, 2013	181
		<b>Total</b>	<b>508</b>

Note: All meetings were from 5:30 to 7:00 pm.

The open houses were geared to provide information to the public on the content of the Draft RMP/EIS as well as to provide guidance on commenting on the document and answer questions. Each open house included a PowerPoint presentation which provided an overview of the planning process and a comparison of major elements contained in the Draft RMP/EIS. Attendees were then encouraged to visit with BLM representatives and managers regarding questions or concerns about the Draft RMP/EIS. The public was provided with the opportunity to submit written comments at the open houses.

### 5.5.8 Distribution and Availability of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS

A Notice of Availability will be published in the Federal Register to notify the public of the availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The Notice of Availability will also outline protest procedures during the 30-calendar day protest period. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be available for downloading from the RMP website at [/www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/gjfo/rmp.html](http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/gjfo/rmp.html). The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will also be available for review at the GJFO and community libraries listed on the RMP website. Press releases will be issued to notify the public of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS availability. A list of entities

receiving paper copies of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS is available in the administrative record.

## **5.6 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT RMP/EIS**

### **5.6.1 Process and Methodology**

According to NEPA, the BLM is required to identify and formally respond to all substantive public comments received during the comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS. The BLM developed a systematic process for responding to comments to ensure all substantive comments were tracked and the content seriously considered. A description of this process follows.

First, the BLM developed a coding structure to help sort comments into logical groups by topics and issues. Codes were derived from resources covered in the Draft RMP/EIS or by common issues. Submissions (e.g., letters, emails, faxes, etc.) were given a unique identifier for tracking purposes and then each submission was carefully reviewed to capture all comments, if substantive (more description of this process is set forth below). All comments received can be tracked to the original submission.

Second, the BLM created a comment database. For each comment in a unique submission, the BLM captured the name and address of the Commenter, assigned a code to the comment, and captured the text of all substantive comments.

The coding and comment database processes aimed at assisting the GJFO in determining if the substantive issues raised by the public warranted modification of one or more of the alternatives or further analysis of issues and impacts. The criteria for determining whether a comment was substantive or nonsubstantive are described in detail in Section 6.1. With the information provided through the public review process, the BLM reconsidered the draft alternatives, made changes as appropriate, and developed the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Factual or grammatical errors which led to a change in text are not summarized but were incorporated into the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Finally, the BLM used the comment database to prepare a narrative summary of the substantive comments. Opinions, feelings, and preferences for one element or one alternative over another, and comments of a personal and/or philosophical nature were all read, analyzed, and considered, but because such comments are not substantive in nature, the BLM did not respond to them.

### **5.6.2 Summary of Written Comments Received**

The comment period closed on June 24, 2013. All written comments sent before 12:00 AM on June 25, 2013, were accepted as official comments. These included those sent by US mail postmarked on June 24, 2013, and email messages and facsimiles sent on June 24, 2013, regardless of when they were received. Some comments were duplicated with an email message and a letter

submitted via US mail. Identical comments from the same party were considered only once.

**Table 5-4** displays a summary of the substantive public comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS. Responses to these comments are provided and discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

**Table 5-5**, Number of Substantive Submissions by Commenter Affiliation, displays the total number of submissions (e.g., letters, emails, faxes, comment forms) received by individuals, government agencies, organizations, businesses, and others. Note that one submission (e.g., a letter) may have multiple discrete comments within it; therefore, the number of submissions is less than the number of comments in Table 5-4.

In addition, 521 submissions were received that did not contain any substantive comments.

Finally, as of August 2014, 73 submissions were received after the comment period closed. These submissions were reviewed for consideration during development of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, but are not included in the responses to substantive comments in Chapter 6.

**Table 5-4**  
**Summary of Substantive Comments Received on Draft RMP/EIS**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of Comments</b>
Air Quality	80
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	23
Cultural and Heritage Resources	8
Drought Management and Climate Change	3
Edits	73
Energy Development	57
Fire Management	5
Fish and Wildlife	29
FLPMA, NEPA, etc.	32
Forestry	3
General	12
Geology and Soils	7
GIS Data	5
Hazardous Materials	-
Land Use	-
Lands and Realty	14
Livestock Grazing	6
Minerals and Mining	13
National Trails and Byways	-
Noise	-
Paleontological Resources	2
Public Health and Safety	5

**Table 5-4**  
**Summary of Substantive Comments Received on Draft RMP/EIS**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of Comments</b>
Recreation	87
Renewable Energy	-
Route Designations	1,645
Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice	91
Special Designation Areas – General	-
Special Status Fish	1
Special Status Plants	6
Special Status Species General	29
Special Status Wildlife	19
Stipulations	38
Traffic and Transportation	2
Travel Management	66
Tribal Interests and Native American Religious Concerns	-
Vegetation	9
Visual Resources	8
Water Resources	35
Weeds	2
Wetland and Riparian Vegetation	-
Wild and Scenic Rivers	21
Wild Horses	-
Wilderness and WSAs	4
Wilderness Characteristics	98
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,538</b>

**Table 5-5**  
**Number of Substantive Submissions by Commenter Affiliation**

<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Number of Comments</b>
Local Government Agency	7
State Government Agency	4
Business/Commercial Sector	14
Educational Institution	0
Elected Official	1
Federal Government Agency	5
Individual	683
Organization (non-profit, citizen's group)	269
Tribal Government	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>983</b>

## 5.7 LIST OF PREPARERS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>
<b>Grand Junction Field Office</b>	
Katie Stevens	Field Manager
<i>Catherine Robertson</i>	<i>Field Manager</i>
Wayne Werkmeister	Associate Field Manager
Christina Stark	Planning and Environmental Coordinator; Lands and Realty; Renewable Energy; Riparian; ACECs; Socioeconomics; Environmental Justice; Public Health and Safety
<i>Collin Ewing</i>	<i>Planning and Environmental Coordinator; ACECs; Socioeconomics; Environmental Justice; Public Health and Safety</i>
<i>Matt Anderson</i>	<i>Planning and Environmental Coordinator</i>
Michelle Bailey	Recreation; Travel Management; Interpretation and Environmental Education; National, Scenic, and Historic Trails; National, State; and BLM Byways; Wild and Scenic Rivers; Lands with Wilderness Characteristics; Wilderness Study Areas; Visual Resources
<i>Terry Bridgman</i>	<i>Livestock Grazing</i>
Julia Christiansen	Energy and Minerals
Natalie Clark	Cultural Resources; Native American Tribal Uses
Scott Clarke	Livestock Grazing
<i>Bridget Clayton</i>	<i>Energy and Minerals</i>
Forest Cook	Air Resources (Colorado State Office)
Doug Diekman	GIS
<i>Nathan Dieterich</i>	<i>Water Resources; Soils</i>
Jim Dollerschell	Livestock Grazing; Wild Horses
<i>Robert Fowler</i>	<i>Livestock Grazing; Riparian</i>
Scott Gerwe	Energy and Minerals; Paleontology; Geology
<i>Chris Ham</i>	<i>Recreation</i>
Bob Hartman	Energy and Minerals
Lathan Johnson	Wildland Fire Management
Mike Jones	Recreation
Robin Lacy	Lands and Realty
<i>Aline LaForge</i>	<i>Cultural Resources; Native American Tribal Uses</i>
<i>Alissa Leavitt-Reynolds</i>	<i>Cultural Resources; Native American Tribal Uses</i>
Anna Lincoln	Vegetation; Special Status Species
Jacob Martin	Forestry
Chad Meister	Air Resources (Colorado State Office)
Chris Pipkin	Recreation; Travel Management; Interpretation and Environmental Education; National, Scenic, and Historic Trails; National, State; and BLM Byways; Visual Resources
Heidi Plank	Fish and Wildlife; Special Status Species
<i>Adam Straubinger</i>	<i>Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Inventory</i>
Mark Taber	Weeds
Andy Windsor	Recreation
<i>Cathy Ventling</i>	<i>Energy and Minerals</i>
<i>Aaron Young</i>	<i>GIS</i>
<b>US Geological Survey</b>	
Steve Garman	Land Use Model

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>
<b>EMPSi Team</b>	
David Batts	Principal in Charge
Drew Vankat	Project Manager; Recreation; Travel Management
Jennifer Whitaker	Deputy Project Manager; Energy and Minerals
James Bode	Wilderness Study Areas
Kevin Doyle	Cultural Resources; Paleontology; Native American Tribal Uses
Andrew Gentile	Renewable Energy
Zoe Ghali	Forestry; National, Scenic, and Historic Trails; National, State, and BLM Byways
Derek Holmgren	Water Resources
Julia Howe	Visual Resources
Cliff Jarman	Energy and Minerals; Geology
Jenna Jonker	GIS
Kate Krebs	Visual Resources; Wild and Scenic Rivers; Wilderness Study Areas; Lands with Wilderness Characteristics
Craig Miller	Fish and Wildlife
Rod Moraga	Wildland Fire Management
Ralph Morris	Air and Climate
Stephanie Phippen	Soils
Holly Prohaska	Livestock Grazing; Wild Horses
Marcia Rickey	GIS
Jennifer Thies	Lands and Realty
Meredith Zaccherio	Fish and Wildlife; Special Status Species; Vegetation; ACECs
Jim Zapert	Air and Climate
<b>Colorado Mesa University</b>	
Tim Casey	Socioeconomic Resources; Community Assessment; Recreation Planning Report
James Curtsinger	Socioeconomic Resources; Environmental Justice
Justin Gollob	Socioeconomic Resources; Environmental Justice
John Redifer	Socioeconomic Resources; Environmental Justice

*Italicized text denotes former GJFO staff member*

This page intentionally left blank.