

5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the agency consultation and coordination that occurred prior to and during preparation of this RMP/EIS. It also includes the list of agencies and individuals who received the draft document. The consultation process began with a Notice of Intent to prepare an RMP/EIS on June 4, 2003, as required under NEPA.

The BLM decision-making process is conducted in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality, and the policies and procedures used by the Department of Interior (DOI) and the BLM to implement NEPA. NEPA and its associated regulatory and policy framework require the following: 1) that all federal agencies involve interested groups of the public, as well as state and local governments, other federal agencies, and interested Tribes, in their decision-making process, 2) that a reasonable range of alternatives is developed, and 3) that all potential impacts of proposed actions and alternatives are disclosed.

The RMP/EIS was prepared by an interdisciplinary team of specialists from the Moab Field Office (FO) and SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA), the third-party contractor hired to assist in the preparation of the RMP/EIS. The BLM and cooperating federal, state, and county agencies provided technical review and support.

This environmental document was prepared in consultation and coordination with various federal, state, and local agencies, organizations, and individuals. Agency consultation and public participation have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including scoping meetings, workshops, correspondence (both traditional and electronic), meetings with various public agencies and interest groups, and a series of informational bulletins. This section summarizes these activities.

5.2 SPECIFIC CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS

Federal laws require the BLM to consult with Native American Tribes, the State Historic Preservation Office, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) during the planning/NEPA decision-making process. This section documents the specific consultation and coordination efforts undertaken by the BLM throughout the entire process of developing the draft RMP/EIS.

5.2.1 TRIBES

The BLM is mandated to consult with Native American tribes concerning the identification of their cultural values, religious beliefs, and traditional practices that may be affected by actions on federal lands. Laws and executive orders requiring consultation include the following:

- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA)
- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA)
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (AIRFA)
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990, as amended (NAGPRA)
- Federal Land Management and Policy Act of 1976 (FLMPA)
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA)
- Executive Order 11593 - Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment
- Executive Order 12898 - Environmental Justice
- Executive Order 13007 - Indian Sacred Sites
- Executive Order 13175 - Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments

Additionally, the BLM has developed guidelines for consultation with Native American groups. BLM Manuals 8160 (*Native American Coordination and Consultation*; BLM 2003e) and H-8160-1 (*General Procedural Guidance for Native American Consultation*; BLM 2003f) provide consultation requirements and procedural guidance to ensure that the consultation record demonstrates "that the responsible manager has made a reasonable and good faith effort to obtain and consider appropriate Native American input in decision making" (H-8160-1, 2003f:4). Recommended procedures for initiating the consultation process include project notification, preferably by certified mail, follow-up contact (e.g., telephone calls), and meetings when appropriate (H-8160-1, 2003f:15).

Native American organizations were invited to participate at all levels of the planning process for the RMP. On August 1, 2003, the BLM's Utah State Director, Sally Wisely, notified 35 tribal entities of the intent of the BLM's Moab FO to prepare an RMP/EIS. Further, these tribal entities were invited to consult on the entire range of cultural and natural resource issues (Table 5.1). Between November 2002 and May 2003 all 35 tribes were contacted by SWCA ethnographer Molly Molenaar to 1) ensure that the consultation letter was received by the appropriate tribal contact, and 2) determine the need for additional or future consultation for the study areas identified in the consultation letter. As part of the scoping process, meetings with tribes were arranged when requested. During these meetings an emphasis was placed on the discussion and identification of historic properties having cultural significance to tribes (commonly referred to as traditional cultural properties [TCPs]), pursuant to the consultation requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Likewise, in furtherance of the EIS scoping process and the NHPA consultation requirements, the Moab FO participated in 12 meetings with tribal entities (Table 5.2). Several tribal entities requested that an additional meeting be held after the draft RMP/EIS alternatives were prepared. The Moab FO mailed a draft copy of the range of alternatives to 12 tribes in December 2005. In 2006 and 2007, the Moab FO manager and archaeologist, assisted by SWCA, participated in a second round of meetings with five tribes (Table 5.3). At these meetings the draft RMP/EIS alternatives were discussed with special emphasis on cultural resource issues.

Table 5.1 Tribal Entities Contacted by the BLM, Utah State Director, Regarding Moab and Monticello RMP/EISs

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Navajo Nation | Hopi Tribe |
| Navajo Utah Commission | Navajo Nation, Aneth Chapter |
| Navajo Nation, Dennehotso Chapter | Navajo Nation, Mexican Water Chapter |
| Navajo Nation, Navajo Mountain Chapter | Navajo Nation, Oljato Chapter |
| Navajo Nation, Red Mesa Chapter | Navajo Nation, Teec Nos Pos Chapter |
| Ute Mountain Ute Tribe | White Mesa Ute Council |
| Southern Ute Tribe | Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah |
| Pueblo of Taos | Pueblo of Santa Clara |
| Pueblo of Zia | Pueblo of Zuni |
| Pueblo of Laguna | Eastern Shoshone Tribe |
| Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe | Kaibab Paiute Tribe |
| San Juan Southern Paiute Council | Pueblo of Acoma |
| Pueblo of Cochiti | Pueblo of Isleta |
| Pueblo of Jemez | Pueblo of Laguna |
| Pueblo of Nambe | Pueblo of Picuris |
| Pueblo of Pojoaque | Pueblo of Sandia |
| Pueblo of Santa Ana | Pueblo of Tesuque |
| Pueblo of Santo Domingo | |

Table 5.2. Meetings with Tribal Entities as Part of Scoping

| | |
|--|--|
| Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Office | Hopi Cultural Preservation Office |
| Navajo Utah Commission | Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Cultural Resources Department |
| Navajo Nation, Dennehotso Chapter | Pueblo of Santa Clara |
| Pueblo of Zia | Pueblo of Zuni |
| Pueblo of Laguna, NAGPRA Committee | Southern Ute Tribal Council |
| Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe Business Committee | Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Council |

Table 5.3. Meetings with Tribal Entities to Discuss RMP/EIS Alternatives

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Office | Hopi Cultural Preservation Office |
| Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Cultural Resources Department | Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Council |
| Southern Ute Tribal Council | |

5.2.1.1 TRIBAL CONCERNS, COMMENTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Below is a summary of the tribal consultation and coordination meetings held during the RMP planning process. Only comments concerning actions in the Moab FO are included below. Where appropriate, tribal concerns have been incorporated into the BLM's land management decision-making process.

5.2.1.1.1 NAVAJO

As part of the scoping process and pursuant to NHPA's consultation requirements, the Moab FO jointly met with the Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Office and the Navajo Utah Commission in 2003. The Moab FO held a second meeting with the Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Office in 2006 to discuss the draft RMP/EIS range of alternatives.

5.2.1.1.1.1 Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Office

Meeting held on December 9, 2003

The following requests were made and concerns were voiced:

- The Navajo Nation would like to see language in the RMP/EIS that the BLM would notify the Navajo Nation chapters of the availability of firewood.
- Adequate consultation with the Navajo Nation chapters on a variety of issues, including wilderness and cultural resource management, needs to take place. The Navajo understand the relationship between the major cultural attractions in the Four Corners and the economy of this area. They understand that when tourists come to these attractions, they visit adjacent areas and have a significant economic impact. For the Navajo tribe, the key to this interaction is the sensitivity visitors have when visiting cultural sites.
- The Navajo Nation would like to see flexibility in how the RMP/EIS is interpreted, as appropriate.
- The Navajo Nation is interested in the type and quantity of archaeological records the BLM is using in the RMP/EIS process.

Meeting held on November 13, 2006

The following requests were made and concerns were voiced:

- Navajo cultural materials may exist in the Moab area because Navajo ancestors made ceremonial trips to the north. Remains that might be encountered are cultural material scatters containing lithics, beads, prayer sticks, and feathers. Rock cairns that are found in Lisbon Valley are most likely boundary markers between Ute, Apache, and Navajo territories during times of war. The migration route through the Moab area was also used during times of war—some petroglyphs in this area were carved by war parties.
- The Navajo would like a list/catalog of rock art sites in the Moab FO.
- The Navajo are concerned for the potential for water contamination of natural springs and in plant gathering areas.

5.2.1.1.1.2 Navajo Utah Commission

Meeting held on February 11, 2004

The Navajo Commission stated the following:

- Medicine men need to have access to BLM lands.
- The BLM needs to consult with all Navajo chapters in Utah concerning the RMP/EIS.

5.2.1.1.2 PAIUTE INDIAN TRIBE OF UTAH

The Moab FO archaeologist met with the cultural resources director for the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah in 2004 as part of the scoping process in furtherance of the NHPA's consultation requirements. The Moab FO manager and archaeologist met again with the cultural resource director in 2006 to discuss the range of alternatives in the Moab RMP/EIS.

Meeting held on January 16, 2004

The Paiute raised the following concerns:

- The Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah indicated they would not request cooperating agency status for the RMP/EIS, but the tribe would like to be informed when meetings occur.
- Plant resources should be protected. Ms. Dorena Martineau (cultural resource director) would provide the BLM with a list of plants and minerals that are significant to the Paiutes. For instance, willow is still being used for basketmaking, and the Paiutes have a program underway that brings elders and youth together to make baskets. Sage is still used as a medicinal herb and in teas. Ms. Martineau indicated her intent to draft a letter stating the Paiute Tribe's concern about sage die-off in the Moab FO area, and that these concerns should be included in the management plans. Cottonwood bark, yarrow, and squirrel tail are other plant resources currently being used by Paiute elders.
- BLM should protect water sources.
- Petroglyph vandalism is also a concern.

Meeting held on December 6, 2006

The Paiute raised the following concerns:

- BLM should protect culturally significant plant and mineral resources. BLM should protect all petroglyph sites managed by the Moab FO, regardless of their cultural significance to the Paiute Tribe.
- BLM should be aware of concerns about the potential damage to cultural resources by seismic activity in the Moab FO area.

5.2.1.1.3 UTE

As part of the scoping process and in furtherance of the NHPA's consultation requirements, the BLM Moab FO jointly met with the Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Council and the Southern Ute Tribal Council in 2004, and the Moab FO met separately with the Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian

Tribe in 2004. The Moab FO met with all three tribes in 2006-2007 to discuss the Moab Draft RMP/EIS range of alternatives.

5.2.1.1.3.1 Southern Ute Tribe

Meeting held on March 30, 2004

Southern Ute Chairman Howard Richards designated Neil Cloud (Southern Ute NAGPRA coordinator) as the first point of contact for future BLM meetings, field visits, and correspondence as the planning process proceeds. Chairman Richards should be copied in on all correspondence with Mr. Cloud.

According to Chairman Richards, the Utes have never given away the right to sacred areas. The FOs should consult with the Native American liaison for the White River National Forest, Bill Kite, on strategies for effective consultation with the Ute tribes.

Meeting held October 11, 2006

The Southern Ute Tribal Council expressed concerns about the appropriate protection of cultural resources, especially in light of the recent increase of oil and gas development.

According to their histories, the Southern Ute people most likely passed through the Moab FO lands, as did many other tribes. However, there would be few sites in the Moab area that would be significant to the Southern Utes. Any Southern Ute sites remaining would most likely be temporary campsites and vision quest sites, but hunting locations would have been limited to the mountains.

Culturally significant plants, such as in areas with a sagebrush and tobacco mix, may need to be protected. The Southern Ute chairman would work with the Moab FO archaeologist to identify elders who have plant expertise.

The Spanish Trail should be known as the Ute Trail, and research on this trail should take into account the Native American perspective.

5.2.1.1.3.2 Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe

Meeting held on May 19, 2004

Ute Business Committee members said that decisions made by divisions of the Ute Tribe are nonbinding. Only the Ute Business Committee has the authority to consult with federal agencies and make final decisions that will affect the Ute Tribe.

Consultation is considered to be government-to-government only when it has been pre-approved by the Ute Business Committee.

Current (2004) maps show the Ute Reservation as part of BLM lands (within the boundaries of BLM-Moab lands), which should be corrected.

The BLM should include protection of Ute medicinal and traditional plants in the RMPs; wild tobacco, pinyon, and cedar were mentioned. Ute elders would like to have access to plant-gathering areas, particularly in the Moab FO area.

Ute Business Committee members asked that the BLM continue to consult with them and also with the Ute Cultural Rights and Protection Office and the Ute Fish and Wildlife Office.

Informal Meeting Held on February 5, 2006

The Ute Business Committee did not have a quorum to consult with the Moab FO during the agreed-upon time: 1:30 PM on Monday, February 5, 2006. However, committee member Ron Groves spoke to the Moab FO manager and archaeologist in the committee chambers about the draft RMP/EIS. This meeting was not considered government-to-government consultation, and the FO manager offered to meet with the Ute Business Committee at another time, preferably after the draft RMP/EIS has been prepared.

Mr. Groves asked for no development in ACECs and said that the tribe would like to continue to consult about ACECs in the Moab FO area. The tribe needs to have access to certain areas for plant collection and has a new Natural Resources Program that will try to work with agency officials to gather information about plant-gathering areas on federal and state lands. Shawn Champoos is the director of this new program. Please send original project letters to the Chairwoman Maxine Natchees with copies to Shawn Champoos and Betsy Champoos at the Cultural Rights and Protection Program.

5.2.1.1.3.3 Ute Mountain Ute Tribe

Meeting held on August 26, 2004

The tribe represented the following concerns:

- The proposed RMP is a political document rather than a management document. Additional meetings may be required to discuss specific resource issues.
- The tribe expressed its concern that historic district designations and legislation regarding water quality, clean air, and wilderness designations eventually prevent people from using the lands. This does not always benefit the tribe. For example, areas with special designations can have too many restrictions on grazing permits. A request was made for maps that identify WSAs.
- Areas with Mancos shale (called green rock by the Utes) located near Moab are culturally significant to the Utes.
- The Ute Mountain Ute Tribe is familiar with a proposal for a tailings pond in the Crescent Junction area and supports the proposal because there are not many Ute artifacts in that general area.
- Carl Knight was identified as a future contact for the tribe if additional meetings are required.
- Concern was expressed about "people from the East" (i.e., the U.S. Congress) often commenting on these types of plans and decisions based on their own outside agendas. How much authority does the BLM really have over this plan? If the BLM does not have the authority to consult, then the meeting should not be considered government-to-government

consultation. The tribe requested a copy of the BLM tribal consultation policy, which was provided at a later date.

Meeting held on February 9, 2007

The tribe is concerned about restricted access to outcrops of the Morrison Formation, in which tribal elders collect minerals, specifically Mancos shale, for ceremonial use. The most distinctive and visible source of Mancos shale is an area adjacent to U.S. Highway 191 between Moab and Crescent Junction, where teal-green bands of the rock can be seen. This area is known as the Dalton Wells area, and the tribe wants access to it at all times.

5.2.1.1.4 PUEBLOS

Representatives from the Moab FO participated in a meeting with the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office in December 2003 as part of the scoping process in furtherance of NHPA's consultation requirements. The Moab FO manager and archaeologist represented both FOs during meetings with the Pueblos of Zuni, Laguna, Zia, and Santa Clara. The Moab FO manager and archaeologist met with the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office again in 2006 to discuss the Moab draft RMP/EIS range of alternatives.

5.2.1.1.4.1 Hopi Tribe

Meeting held on December 17, 2003

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office is interested in the Moab management plan because of the large number of archaeological sites in the FO areas. It is unlikely, however, that the Tribe will request cooperating agency status for the plans.

The overriding issue that the Hopi Tribe has with the BLM is its reburial policy (Instructional Memorandum 98-131-2), which prohibits reburial of human remains (subject to NAGPRA) on BLM lands. The tribe is currently seeking "protection and perpetuity" for burials and reburials on BLM lands. If the policy is revoked, reburial locations will have to be chosen on public lands. ACECs and Puebloan ancestral sites could be considered for reburial locations. Other ideas discussed during the meeting were the development of a cemetery on public lands or the use of an environmental non-development zone; however, the preference is to have a reburial location that does not attract visitors. [Note: Since this consultation, BLM Instructional Memorandum 2007-002 outlined updated guidance that allows for NAGPRA materials encountered during the course of disturbance activities to be reburied as close as possible to the site, rather than being excavated. However, current guidance does not address the reburial location for the large number of NAGPRA materials housed in BLM museum collections.]

The Tribe will request field visits to determine the presence or absence of Hopi TCPs in the project areas. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma (director of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office) has identified five TCPs in the Moab FO area.

The Tribe voiced a concern about the segmentation of federal actions. It is difficult to protect TCPs when drill pad applications are each considered as a separate application, even though the

same company files dozens of applications at once. The Hopi do not like to see impacts assessed in this manner. The BLM must see the connected action during the environmental review.

The Tribe requested an ethnographic study that would include interviews with elders.

The Hopi have a cultural interest in the Colorado River but did not give any specific information during the meeting.

The Tribe requested that BLM protect areas with great site density within the Moab FO.

Meeting held on November 14, 2006

The BLM needs to better define management resource uses. The Tribe stated that subdivision of the landscape can be bad, especially for assessment of TCPs because TCPs transcend boundaries. It is difficult to "bound" analysis of use of a TCP. The landscape in its entirety should be considered. Subdividing resource issues will create conflicts with Native people because they don't think in those terms.

The concept of TCPs is misunderstood; particularly prehistoric TCPs. Hopi migration routes center on or are aligned with water resources. Other locations are considered culturally significant to several tribes. A roundtable discussion would be an appropriate way to discuss this type of cultural interaction.

The Hopi have a cultural interest in the golden eagle and bald eagle. BLM should conduct additional research that considers the Hopi cultural importance of these species and the scientific understanding of golden eagle habitat.

The Hope are concerned that small drilling programs lead to full field development. The Tribe stated that the EAs that are done for exploration usually lead directly to drilling, but no further analysis is done for the drilling because the new energy policy allows for this type of expedited development without impact analysis specific to the drilling.

The Spanish Trail and other travel routes are critical to understanding cultural interactions that existed in the Moab FO area. The Hopi are very interested in working with BLM to better understand the migration corridors that existed in the Moab FO area. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office director requested to be involved in additional consultation concerning migration routes. A suggestion was made to meet again with the BLM to talk about migration routes and rock cairns that are associated with these routes.

5.2.1.1.4.2 Pueblo of Zuni

Meeting held on March 3, 2004

Zuni would like to develop an access agreement with the Moab FO that would allow them to access resource-gathering areas without having to go through a permit process. The development of an MOU was proposed.

The Zuni requested a list of plant and mineral resources on BLM lands.

The Zuni requested agreements between with the National Park Service and BLM that would allow Zuni elders to collect birds and feathers and to hunt birds on federal lands. It was reported that the rivers and associated bird habitats on Zuni tribal lands have dried up and as a result the elders have had a difficult time hunting birds and collecting feathers.

The Zuni Tribal Council would like to consult on fire management.

Zuni tribal members would like to be able to search for copper on BLM lands.

5.2.1.1.4.3 Pueblo of Laguna

Meeting held on March 3, 2004

The following comments were raised:

- Douglas fir and willows are culturally significant resources currently being used in ceremonies.
- The Laguna requested a field visit. Laguna is particularly interested in seeing rock art sites.
- The Laguna requested additional documentation on cultural resources.

5.2.1.1.4.4 Pueblo of Zia

Meeting held on March 3, 2004

The following comments were raised:

- The Zia requested to collect a few sacks of copper-bearing rocks.
- Research should not be conducted at burial sites. If human remains are found, Zia's position is that human remains should be reburied as close to their original burial location as possible.
- Concerns were raised for protection of rock art, but no specific requests were made. Governor Peter Pino is in favor of any restoration programs that would reduce pot hunting and vandalism.
- The BLM's reburial policy should be revoked, and Zia can provide individuals to testify against this policy. [Note: Since this consultation, BLM Instructional Memorandum 2007-002 outlined updated guidance that allows for NAGPRA materials encountered during the course of disturbance activities to be reburied as close as possible to the site, rather than being excavated. However, current guidance does not address the reburial location for the large number of NAGPRA materials housed in BLM museum collections.]
- Burials should not be used for research studies.
- The Zia requested a copy of the National Policy for Land Exchange.
- The Zia requested additional cultural information on the Fremont culture.

5.2.1.1.4.5 Santa Clara Pueblo

Meeting held on March 2, 2004

According to their histories, Santa Clara elders went as far as Utah for trading and hunting; there may be significant sites and artifacts, but the locations of these sites and artifacts are unknown. A field visit was requested.

Santa Clara does not believe that the repatriation of human remains should be carried out. Burials should not be moved once they are discovered.

Archaeological sites should not be flagged. This draws attention to sites.

Santa Clara would like to be notified about project treatment plans when they include archaeologically sensitive locations within a project area. There is rarely any follow-up or notice of project completion sent to consulting tribes. This needs to be corrected for future projects.

Would the BLM consider organizing a committee including tribal representatives for human remains discoveries?

A concern was voiced for the protection of TCPs, especially from recreationists, but no specific requests were made.

A request was made for a copy of the meeting notes.

5.2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The EPA's air quality protocols are used as guideline standards for this document.

5.2.3 U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (USFWS)

The actions proposed in this document require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. These actions have met any consultation/coordination requirements that may exist pursuant to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

The BLM and the USFWS are continuing close coordination for Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance of all aspects of the Moab RMP/EIS.

The USFWS and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) have been consulted regarding the effects of the draft RMP/EIS on species listed pursuant to the ESA. Endangered species protections include compliance with existing ESA requirements.

In July 2004 the BLM requested assistance from the USFWS in identifying threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate plant and animal species that may be located in the Moab planning area. A letter was sent by the BLM State Office to the USFWS initiating informal consultation for the Moab planning effort. The USFWS responded with lists of species that may

be present in or may be affected by projects in the project area. Table 3.45 presents a comprehensive list of sensitive species that may be present in the project area and indicates whether they could be affected by the proposed and alternative actions. The results of this coordination have been incorporated into this RMP/EIS.

5.2.4 STATE AGENCY COORDINATION

NEPA requires that the Lead Agency (BLM) formally consult with responsible and trustee agencies in determining whether to prepare an EIS. The primary tool for this coordination is the preparation of the draft alternatives (Chapter 2) for review by state agencies, and subsequently the preparation of the Draft RMP/EIS. A draft was sent to the State of Utah Department of Natural Resources on March 21, 2007 and distributed to the following agencies: The Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining; Utah Division of Wildlife Resources; Utah State Parks and Recreation; Utah Geological Survey; the Division of State History; and the Utah Division of Administrative Services.

5.2.5 COOPERATING AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

Cooperating agency status has been extended to federal, state, and local agencies with regard to the Moab RMP/EIS planning effort. Both San Juan and Grand Counties signed MOUs in 2001 and 2002 to be cooperating agencies. The State of Utah signed a cooperating agency agreement in 2001. Cooperating agencies that have participated in the development of the Draft RMP/EIS are listed below.

Table 5.4 Cooperating Agencies

| |
|--------------------------------|
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| State of Utah |
| Grand County |
| San Juan County |

More than 60 meetings have been held with the cooperating agencies throughout the planning process, occurring between March 2003 and March 2007. RMP/EIS-related topics discussed in these meetings include socioeconomics, Wild and Scenic River suitability, ACEC relevance and determination, travel plans, and the development of alternatives for all resources.

5.2.6 OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT/COORDINATION

In addition to the cooperating agencies, the Moab FO has held meetings with and sought the input of other agencies that have land management jurisdiction within or adjacent to the planning area. Agencies include the U.S. National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, adjoining BLM field offices, including Grand Junction, Durango, Montrose, Price, Monticello and Vernal, as well as the BLM Utah State Office.

5.2.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

To satisfy the public participation requirements of FLPMA (43 USC 1712), the FLPMA implementing regulations (43 CFR 1610.2), NEPA (42 USC 4371), and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations at 40 CFR 1501.7, the Moab FO initiated the scoping process. This process began with the publication of the June 2003 NOI in the Federal Register. Specifically, the scoping period lasted from June 4, 2003 to January 31, 2004.

5.2.8 SCOPING

BLM relied on various methods for the scoping process, including 6 open houses in different communities (see Table 5.5), a mobile "comment cruiser" that visited 12 locations, a website with provision for e-mailing comments, and an invitation for the public to provide written comments via letters. In its Scoping Report, completed in July 2004, The Moab FO provided a detailed description of the scoping process, planning issues derived from the comments, and analysis of the information received. The Scoping Report is available at the Moab FO, or online at the Moab RMP website (<http://www.blm.gov/rmp/ut/moab/>). BLM received 6,138 comment letters with 19,437 comments identified in these letters and emails. Comments from the 6 open houses totaled 1,250, and the "comment cruiser" gathered 200 comments, resulting in a grand total of 20,887 comments. It should be noted that the Scoping Report covers both the Moab and Monticello Field Offices.

Table 5.5. Open House Locations and Attendance

| Meeting | Location | Attendance |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Green River, UT | October 14, 2003 | 15 |
| Grand Junction, CO | October 15, 2003 | 14 |
| Moab, UT | October 16, 2003 | 53 |
| Monticello, UT | October 21, 2003 | 54 |
| Blanding, UT | October 22, 2003 | 87 |
| Salt Lake City, UT | November 13, 2003 | 96 |
| Total | | 321 |

5.2.9 NATIONAL MAILING LIST

The mailing list for public scoping was developed initially from the Moab FO mailing lists and has been supplemented throughout the planning process. Those interested in being kept up to date on the process are able to submit their home or email address either by attending a public meeting, via the project web site, or by contacting BLM staff at the FO locations.

5.2.10 WEB SITE

Information on the Moab RMP/EIS can also be found at <http://www.blm.gov/rmp/ut/moab/>. The purpose of the web site is to provide the public with further opportunity to learn about the Moab planning area, its resource issues, the project purpose and need, and the planning process. The

web site provides the public with access to all published bulletins and documents associated with the planning process. The website was also used during the public scoping process as an avenue for the public to submit their issues and concerns.

5.2.11 SOCIOECONOMIC WORKSHOPS

With the purpose of engaging in a collaborative decision-making process, the BLM held two workshops with the local government leaders, industry experts, and stakeholders from Grand and San Juan Counties that focused on the socioeconomic conditions of the region. This specialized group was assembled with the help of county officials for the purpose of promoting an open discussion about regional social and economic patterns. These meetings, held on May 6, 2003 in Monticello and on May 12, 2003 in Moab, provided an opportunity for the BLM to understand existing conditions and to lay the framework for the analysis of socioeconomic impacts. As the development of the RMP/EIS ensued, an additional socioeconomic discussion group was convened in order to discuss how to measure the impacts of BLM management actions on the local communities. This meeting was held on April 7, 2006 and included Moab FO manager, Moab FO staff and county and state officials.

5.2.12 DRAFT RMP/EIS

Public participation will continue with the release of this Draft RMP/RMP. The public will be given an opportunity to review and comment on the draft plan during a specified 90-day comment period. As with the scoping meetings held in 2003, a series of public meetings will be held to gather comments on the Draft EIS and Proposed RMP. The Final EIS will incorporate all substantive comments received during the comment period. After the Proposed RMP is issued, there is a 60-day review period for the Governor's Office, and a 30 day protest resolution period. After the release of the Final EIS, BLM will resolve protests and issue the Record of Decision.

5.3 LIST OF PREPARERS

The BLM Moab FO RMP/EIS was written and produced by a team composed of specialists from the Moab FO and specialists from SWCA Environmental Consultants, an independent, third-party consulting firm. Under the guidance and direction of the BLM, the team prepared alternatives, collected data for the analysis, assessed potential affects of the alternatives, and prepared other chapters with additional comments and critiques from the cooperating agencies.

Table 5.6. List of Preparers

| Name | Position | Planning Role |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| BLM | | |
| Ann Marie Aubry, B.S. | Hydrologist | Air Quality, Soils/Watershed |
| Dusty Carpenter, B.S. | Ecology SCEP | Livestock Grazing |
| Jean Carson | GIS Specialist | GIS Mapping |
| Kate Juenger | Planning Coordinator, Fire | Fire Management |
| Brent Northrup, B.S. | Resource Advisor | RMP Project Manager, Minerals, Health |

Table 5.6. List of Preparers

| Name | Position | Planning Role |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | and Safety |
| Marilyn Peterson, B.S. | Outdoor Recreation Planner | Special Designations (Wild and Scenic Rivers) |
| Pam Riddle, B.S. | Wildlife Biologist | Wildlife and Fisheries, Special Status Animal Species |
| Bill Stevens, Ph.D. | Planning Specialist | Wilderness, Socioeconomics, Wilderness Characteristics, Travel |
| Katie Stevens, Ph.D. | Outdoor Recreation Planner | Special Designations (ACECs), Recreation, QA/QC, |
| Rob Sweeten, B.S. | Landscape Architect | Visual Resource Management |
| Daryl Trotter, B.S. | Environmental Protection Specialist | NEPA Specialist, Riparian, Special Status Plant Species, Vegetation, Woodlands |
| Donna Turnipseed, M.A. | Archaeologist | Cultural, Paleontology, Special Designations (National Historic Trails) |
| Mary von Koch, M.S. | Realty Specialist | Lands and Realty |
| Doug Wight, M.S. | GIS Coordinator | GIS Mapping |
| Dave Williams, B.S. | Range Conservationist | Livestock Grazing |
| Maggie Wyatt, M.A. | Moab Field Office Manager | Field Office Manager |
| SWCA, Inc. | | |
| Matt Petersen, M.S. | Principal Ecologist | NEPA Specialist/QA/QC |
| Deb Reber, B.S. | Natural Resource Planner | Project Manager/ QA/QC |
| Tonya Dombrowski, Ph.D. | Environmental Chemist | Air Quality |
| Sheri Ellis, M.S. | Cultural Resources Lead | Cultural Resources, Lands and Realty |
| Laura Burch, M.P.A. | Environmental Planner | Socioeconomics, Hazardous Materials |
| Jan Reed, B.A. | Ecologist | Livestock Grazing |
| Kristen Knippenberg, M.F.A. | Resource Specialist, Technical Editor | Minerals, editing |
| Paul C. Murphey, Ph.D. | Principal Investigator, Paleontology | Paleontology |
| David Harris, M.S. | NEPA Specialist | Recreation, Travel, Visual Resource Management, Woodlands |
| Eric McCulley, B.S. | Geologist | Riparian, Soils/Watershed |
| Susan Martin, M.S. | Ecologist | Special Status Plant Species, Vegetation |
| Sherri Wysong, B.S. | Resource Specialist | Special Designations, Wilderness Characteristics |
| Greg Larson, M.S. | Resource Specialist | Fire, Lands, Soils |
| Thomas Sharp, M.S. | Ecologist | Special Status Animal Species, Wildlife |
| Molly Mollenaar, M.A. | Cultural Anthropologist | Native American Consultation |
| Tyson Schreiner, B.S. | GIS Coordinator | GIS Mapping |

Table 5.6. List of Preparers

| Name | Position | Planning Role |
|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Dave Reinhart, B.A. | GIS Specialist | GIS Mapping |
| Janet Guinn, B.S. | Project Coordinator | Project Coordination, Formatting |
| Kari Chalker, M.A. | Technical Editors | General |
| Cynthia Manseau, B.A. | Technical Editors | General |