

Chapter 6

Consultation and Coordination

Chapter 6 Table of Contents

Chapter 6 Consultation and Coordination	6-1
6.1 Cooperating Agencies and Consultation	6-1
6.2 Scoping Process	6-3
6.3 DEIS Mailing List.....	6-4
6.4 DEIS Notification and Distribution	6-5
6.5 Next Steps in the Planning Process	6-5
6.6 List of Preparers and Reviewers	6-6

LIST OF TABLES

Table 6.6-1	List of Preparers and Technical Specialists.....	6-6
Table 6.6-2	Third Party Contractor – JBR Environmental Consultants, Inc.	6-7

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 6 Consultation and Coordination

This chapter describes specific actions taken by the BLM EFO to consult and coordinate with Native American Tribes, government agencies, and interested groups, and to involve the interested general public during preparation of this EIS.

A NOI was published in the Federal Register on April 16, 2012, formally announcing the intent to prepare an EIS for the Pan Mine Project. Publication of the NOI initiated the scoping process and invited participation of affected and interested agencies, organizations, and the public in helping the BLM determine the scope and issues to be addressed in the EIS.

Public involvement is an important part of the environmental analysis under the NEPA process. Federal agencies are required to make “diligent efforts” to involve the public early and often in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures, to inform the public by providing public notice of NEPA-related hearings, public meetings, and availability of documents, and to solicit appropriate information from the public (40 Code of Federal Regulation 1506.6).

The goal of the public involvement process is to foster public understanding of the project and allow participation in the analysis and decision-making process regarding the proposed Pan Mine Project EIS.

6.1 Cooperating Agencies and Consultation

Cooperating agencies were invited to participate in the NEPA process including: review of analyses, contribution of technical expertise, and assisting in the response to public comments as required by their jurisdiction or regulatory authority. Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) were developed between the cooperating agencies and the BLM. The purpose of the MOA is to:

- Confirm the formal designation of the BLM as lead agency in the EIS process with the responsibility for the conclusions of the DEIS and FEIS;
- Formally designate cooperating agencies in the EIS planning process;
- Formalize and provide a framework for cooperation and coordination between the BLM and cooperating agency that is necessary in order to successfully complete the EIS in a timely, efficient and thorough manner;
- Describe the respective roles, responsibilities and expertise of each entity in the planning process; and
- Ensure that they working relationship between the BLM and cooperating agency meets the purposes and intent of NEPA.

As part of the federal review process in response to Midway's proposed Pan Mine Project, the BLM sent letters to the agencies below to request participation as cooperating agencies for the NEPA process and EIS documentation. Cooperating agencies included:

- Eureka County;
- White Pine County; and
- NDOW.

Consultation with Native American tribes is part of the NEPA scoping process and a requirement of FLPMA. On June 7, 2012, the BLM mailed a letter to the 11 Tribal governments listed below requesting their assistance in identifying any traditional religious sites or cultural sites of importance that they believe may be impacted by the project. The Yomba Shoshone Tribe responded by deferring to the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe, since the project lies near their reservation.

- Battle Mountain Band Council;
- Confederate Tribes of the Goshute Indian Reservation;
- Duckwater Shoshone Tribe;
- Elko Band Council;
- Ely Shoshone Tribe;
- Las Vegas Paiute Tribe;
- Moapa Band of Paiutes;
- Wells Band Council;
- South Fork Band Council;
- Te-Moak Tribe of the Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada; and
- Yomba Shoshone Tribe.

On July 2, 2012, the BLM met with the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe to discuss proposed mining activities north of the Duckwater Shoshone Reservation.

There will be tribal meetings with the Confederated Tribes of the Goshute and the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe prior to signing the ROD.

Further, since there is a segment of the Lincoln Highway within the project area, BLM has been consulting with the Eastern Nevada Lincoln Highway Association who is a signatory on the Programmatic Agreement which outlines the methods of identification and treatment of cultural resources for the project (Appendix 3B). The Great Basin Heritage Area Partnership has also been contacted; however, they have deferred to the Eastern Nevada Lincoln Highway Association (Gooch, 2013).

6.2 Scoping Process

Notice of Intent

The publication of the NOI initiated a formal 30-day scoping period and announced the locations and dates of the public scoping meetings.

Legal Notices and Press Releases

Public notices were published with the following news sources:

- Reno Gazette Journal April 18, 2012;
- Eureka Sentinel April 19, 2012; and
- Ely Times April 20, 2012.

A BLM press release was sent to the Associated Press and posted to the Ely District webpage on April 16, 2012.

Project Website

A website for the project was launched concurrently with publication of the NOI under BLM Projects on the BLM Ely District webpage (http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/ely_field_office.html), and will remain active throughout the life of the project. Scoping information posted to the project website includes the NOI, the press release, and the scoping letter that includes the project description, comment form, and two project figures including the project location map and the proposed facilities diagram.

Scoping Letter

A scoping letter was prepared and sent to 138 potentially interested parties on April 16, 2012. This letter provided an overview of the proposed project, a project location map and proposed project facilities diagram, and a scoping comment form, and included information regarding participation in the public involvement process, and the schedule for the public scoping meetings. The mailing list of potentially interested parties was compiled by the BLM from existing information on persons with known and potential interest in the project and previous NEPA action mailing lists.

Scoping Meetings

The following three scoping meetings were held at locations in Nevada:

- Ely, Nevada May 1, 2012;
- Eureka, Nevada May 2, 2012; and
- Reno, Nevada May 3, 2012.

The meetings were held from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. All attendees were asked to sign in and provide their contact information. Lists of individuals who signed attendance sheets at the public meetings are included in the Pan Mine Scoping Report (JBR, 2012a). Representatives from the BLM, Midway, and JBR were present at each meeting to answer questions, discuss the project, and accept public comments. Attendees at the scoping meetings were provided with handouts describing the project as well as the NEPA process. Comment forms were also provided to all attendees to facilitate submission of written scoping comments. The public was given the option to provide comments during the meeting, using regular mail, fax, or e-mail. In addition, information regarding the project and the NEPA process was posted on the BLM's project website.

Scoping Response

The 30-day scoping period for the Pan Mine Project, during which comments were received, was from April 16 through May 16, 2012. All responses received by BLM were logged, analyzed, and summarized to discern issues of concern. A total of 32 letters, emails, and faxes were received in response to the request for public comment regarding the project. Of those responses, 23, or approximately 71.9 percent, were unique Individual/Unaffiliated responses. Four responses were received from various Government Employees, Organizations, or Unions (12.5 percent), four responses from Conservation/Preservation Organizations (12.5 percent), and one response was received from a Local Agency/Elected Official (3.1 percent). Copies of all letters, comment forms, faxes, and e-mails received are available in the Pan Mine Scoping Report (JBR, 2012a).

Comments received in response to solicitations, including names and addresses of those who commented, are considered part of the public record on this EIS and are available for public inspection at the BLM Ely District Office.

6.3 DEIS Mailing List

An EIS mailing list of interested persons was initially assembled from the scoping mailing list with the addition of persons who expressed interest in being added to the mailing list during and subsequent to scoping. The mailing list for the project was revised to add those persons who provided comments in response to scoping, requested to be on the mailing list, or signed a scoping meeting attendance list. Respondents that provided more than one comment letter were listed only once in the mailing list.

6.4 DEIS Notification and Distribution

The Pan Mine DEIS review period opened with publication of the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the DEIS in the Federal Register on Friday, March 22, 2013. This began a 45-day comment period. The BLM also announced the availability of the DEIS by publishing notices of availability in local newspapers, on the project website, and through mailing. The DEIS was distributed to interested parties identified in the updated mailing list, as described above, and also made available via the internet.

6.5 Next Steps in the Planning Process

Comments received on the DEIS were evaluated and modifications to the EIS were made as needed. See Chapter 7 for a complete discussion of the comments received on the DEIS and BLM's responses to these comments. A second NOA was published in the Federal Register to notify the public of the availability of the FEIS, a 30-day public availability period under 43 CFR 1610.5-2 will follow, and a copy of the document will be filed with the EPA.

6.6 List of Preparers and Reviewers

Table 6.6-1 List of Preparers and Technical Specialists

BLM Ely District Office	
Project Manager/Minerals/Mining	Miles Kreidler
Field Manager	Jill Moore
Assistant Field Manager	Mindy Seal
Environmental Coordinator/Environmental Justice	Mindy Seal
Public Relations	Chris Hanefeld
Fuels	Cody Coombs
Riparian/Soil/Air/Floodplain	Mark D'Aversa
Noxious/Invasive Weeds	Erica Husse
Range/Grazing/Vegetation Resources	Chris Mayer
Range/Grazing/Vegetation Resources	Garrett Swisher
Cultural Resources/Archeology/Paleontology	Leslie Riley
Wild Horses and Burros	Ruth Thompson
Wildlife/Migratory Birds/Special Status Wildlife and Plant Species	Marian Lichtler
Wilderness/Wilderness Characteristics	Emily Simpson
Recreation/Visual Resources	Erin Rajala
Lands/ROW	Stephanie Trujillo
Hazardous Materials/Public Safety	Melanie Peterson
Tribal Coordinator	Elvis Wall
Midway Gold US Inc.	
Vice President of Environmental Affairs, Midway main contact	Tom Williams
Associate Director of Environmental Affairs, project coordination	Rebecka Snell
Vice President and General Manager of Nevada Operations, local Midway management	Roger Gross
Senior Permitting Manager, local coordination	Andy Britton
GIS Specialist	Aaron Ratke
Senior Engineer	Dave Mosch
VP of Geological Service, geologic information	Bill Neal
SR VP of Operations, engineering information	Rick Moritz
Senior Engineer	Dave Mosch
Nevada Department of Wildlife (Cooperating Agency)	
Habitat Division Chief	Alan Jenne
Supervising Habitat Biologist	Steve Foree
Game Biologist	Mike Podborny
White Pine County, NV (Cooperating Agency)	
Vice Chairman	Laurie Carson
Commissioner	Mike Lemich
Eureka County, NV (Cooperating Agency)	
Commission Chairman	JJ Goicoechea
Natural Resources Manager	Jake Tibbitts

Table 6.6-2 Third Party Contractor – JBR Environmental Consultants, Inc.

Role/Resource	Staff	Experience
Project Manager	Brian Buck	BS Geology MS Geological Engineering 37 years experience
Assistant Project Manager	Kristi Schaff	BS Land Rehabilitation minor in Soils 10 years experience
Lead Author/Land Use and Access	Colleen Lavery	BS Forestry and Natural Resources Management 11 years experience
Cumulative Effects	Steve Morton	BA General Studies Political Science and English 7 years experience
Recreation/Wilderness/Environmental Justice/Visual	George Dix	BS Environmental Resource Management 7 years experience
Vegetation, Special Status Species, Noxious Weeds, Range, Wild Horses	Kendra Olcott	BA Integrated Professional Studies; Natural Resource Management 7 years experience
Soils	Brian Boyd	BS Range Resource and Wildland Soil Science; minor in Geology 11 years experience
Geology, Minerals, and Paleontology	James Sage	BS Geology 15 years experience
Hazardous Materials	Nancy Lightfoot	BS Geology; CEM 12 years experience
Wildlife, Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species, Sensitive Species	Dave Worley	BS Biology; MS Zoology 32 years experience
Wildlife Resources, Including Migratory Birds and Special Status Wildlife	Josh Vittori	BS Forest and Rangeland Management 7 years experience
Noise	David Strohm	BS Meteorology 10 years experience
Air	Aaron Hoberg	BS Chemical Engineering 5 years air experience
Surface Water	Karla Knoop	BS Watershed Science 28 years experience
Groundwater	Alan Mayo	BS Geology; MS Geology; PhD Hydrogeology 28 years experience
Groundwater	Jon Schulman	MS Environmental Engineering 19 years experience
Groundwater	Jonathan Williams	BS Geology 20 years experience
Cultural Resources, Native American Concerns	Jenni Prince-Mahoney	BA Anthropology; MC NEPA 20 years experience
Socioeconomics	Jan Stambro	BA Business Management; MBA 22 years experience
GIS/Drafting	Christine Johnson	BS Geology 11 years drafting experience
GIS/Drafting	Jason Trook	MS Geography 7 years GIS experience

This page intentionally left blank.