CHAPTER 6 – CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

6.1 Introduction

Integrated with the planning, analysis, and review activities of EIS preparation, the BLM is conducting a comprehensive program of agency coordination and public participation, commencing with scoping early on and continuing throughout the NEPA and land-use planning process. The intent of the program is to proactively encourage interaction between the BLM and other federal and state agencies, local governments, American Indian tribes, and the public to keep them informed about the Project through dissemination of information and to solicit information that assists in analysis and decision-making.

Throughout the preparation of this document, formal and informal efforts have been implemented by the BLM to involve, consult, and coordinate with other federal and state agencies and local governments, American Indian tribes, and the public. Such communication is important (1) to ensure the most appropriate data have been gathered and employed for analysis and (2) to ensure agency policy and public sentiment and values are considered and incorporated into decision-making.

This chapter provides a brief description of the methods employed for communication and interaction, which includes consultation and coordination with agencies, tribes, and stakeholders; the scoping process; Applicant-initiated activities; and public review of the Draft EIS and LUPAs.

6.1.1 Consultation and Coordination

Agencies and organizations having jurisdiction and/or specific interest in the Project were contacted at the beginning of scoping, during the resource inventory, and prior to the publication of the EIS to inform them of the Project, verify the status and availability of existing environmental data, request data and comments, and solicit their input about the Project. Additional contacts were made throughout the process to clarify information or update data. All conversations with agency personnel have been documented, distributed to the appropriate Project personnel, and are maintained in the Project administrative record. Specific concerns and recommendations have been discussed and documented for further action. This section describes the consultation and coordination activities that have taken place throughout the NEPA and land-use planning process.

6.2 Early Agency Coordination

As mentioned previously, the Applicant submitted the original application for right-of-way across federal land on November 28, 2007. Most of the federal land crossed by the alternative routes is administered by the BLM; therefore, the BLM was designated the lead agency responsible for preparing the EIS and LUPAs and other documentation in compliance with federal laws, regulations, or policies.

The following year, the Applicant revised the description of the Project and preliminary alternative routes, and submitted to the BLM a revised right-of-way application on December 17, 2008. In early 2009, the BLM Project Manager arranged meetings in February and March with each of the BLM District and Field Offices as well as the National Forests that could be affected by the Project. The purpose of these meetings was to introduce the Project; discuss the process and schedule for preparing the EIS and other environmental documentation; discuss the preliminary alternative routes to be analyzed; and to discuss potential resource conflicts, potential issues, and data needs.

Follow-up working sessions were conducted early in and ongoing throughout the NEPA process to discuss the preliminary alternative routes and potential issues in more detail. These working sessions are listed in Table 6-1.

TABKE 6-1
LIST OF AGENCY WORK SESSIONS

Date	Agencies
June 2009	Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Wyoming State Office, BLM Little Snake Field Office, Colorado State Land Board, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Moffat County
September 2009	BLM Wyoming State Office, BLM Price Field Office, Rocky Mountain Power, TransWest Express, LLC
April 2010	BLM Wyoming State Office, BLM Price Field Office, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Utah Public Lands Policy Coordination Office, Rocky Mountain Power
July 2010	BLM Wyoming State Office, BLM Rawlins Field Office, BLM Rock Springs Field Office, BLM Little Snake Field Office, Wyoming Governor's Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Carbon County, Little Snake River Conservation District, Saratoga-Encampment-Rawlins Conservation District, Rocky Mountain Power
October 2011	BLM Wyoming State Office, BLM Price Field Office, Emery County
December 2011	BLM Wyoming State Office, BLM Price Field Office, Emery County
July 2012	BLM Wyoming State Office, BLM Price Field Office, BLM Richfield Field Office, BLM Vernal Field Office, Ashley National Forest, Dixie National Forest, Manti – La Sal National Forest, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Carbon County, Sanpete County, Duchesne County
August 2012	BLM Wyoming State Office, Dixie National Forest, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest
November 2012	BLM Wyoming State Office, Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and Central Utah Water Conservation District
December 2012	BLM Wyoming State Office, BLM Northwest District Office, BLM Little Snake Field Office, National Park Service, Colorado Parks and Wildlife
June 2013	BLM Wyoming State Office, BLM Rawlins Field Office
December 2013	BLM Wyoming State Office, BLM Utah State Office, BLM Vernal Field Office, BLM National Transmission Support Team

6.2.1 Cooperating Agencies

In late May and June 2009, the BLM sent formal letters inviting all agencies and tribes whose jurisdiction and/or expertise are relevant to the Project to participate as cooperating agencies in the preparation of the EIS and LUPAs. The BLM conducted conference calls on January 14 and 21, 2010, to orient the participating agency personnel to the Project and to discuss their roles and responsibilities on the Project, The agencies that accepted the invitation to participate as cooperating agencies are listed below.

Federal

- Department of Agriculture
  - Forest Service, Intermountain Region
- Department of Defense
  - Army Corps of Engineers
  - Army Environmental Center
  - Navy, Southwest Region
- Department of the Interior
  - Bureau of Indian Affairs
  - Fish and Wildlife Service
  - National Park Service
- Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission

States

- Wyoming
- Utah
- Colorado

Counties

- Wyoming
  - Carbon County
  - Sweetwater County
- Colorado
  - Mesa County
  - Moffat County
  - Rio Blanco County
- Utah
  - Carbon County
  - Duchesne County
  - Emery County
  - Grand County
  - Juab County
  - Sanpete County
  - Uintah County
  - Utah County
  - Wasatch County

Wyoming Conservation Districts

- Little Snake River
- Medicine Bow
- Saratoga-Encampment-Rawlins
- Sweetwater County

Conference calls of the Agency Interdisciplinary Team, including the cooperating agencies, have been conducted once or twice each month to discuss the status of the Project, and to exchange information. In addition, to date, four in-person meetings have been held at key milestones in the NEPA and land-use planning process. The four meetings held and the purpose of each meeting is as follows:

- **September 13, 14, and 16, 2011.** BLM reviewed Project management and administrative protocols, schedule, scoping activities and results, and alternative routes being carried forward for further analysis, and discussed potential plan amendments and resource data collection and inventories. A meeting was held in each of the three states—Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah.
- **December 13, 2011.** BLM reviewed the status of the alternative routes and resource data collection, and reviewed the approach for assessing impacts, planning measures to mitigate impacts, and screening and comparing the alternative routes. The meeting was conducted by webcast.
- **August 20, 22, and 23, 2012.** BLM reviewed resource inventory data, discussed resources issues, and discussed the approach for impact assessment and mitigation planning. A meeting was held in each of the three states.
- **February 5, 6, and 7, 2013.** BLM reviewed the first administrative Draft EIS, discussed comments from the agencies, and initiated discussions to identify an Agency Preferred Alternative. A meeting was held in each of the three states.

Coordination with the Agency Interdisciplinary Team will continue through the completion of the EIS LUPAs and POD.

6.2.2 Consultation

The BLM is required to prepare EISs in coordination with any studies or analyses required by the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), ESA (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and the NHPA, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.). Also, in accordance with Executive Order 13175, BLM must consult, government to government, with American Indians to ensure the tribes are informed about actions that may affect them.

6.2.2.1 Biological Resources

Under the provisions of Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, a federal agency that carries out, permits, licenses, funds, or otherwise authorizes an activity must consult with the FWS as appropriate to ensure the action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species listed under the ESA or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. Informal consultation for the Project began with the submittal of written correspondence to the FWS from the BLM on July 23, 27, and 30, 2009. At the direction of the FWS, the BLM obtained lists of federally threatened, endangered, and candidate species with the potential to occur in the Project area from the FWS. The species lists have been updated as new lists become available to reflect the current listing status of all federally listed and candidate species occurring potentially crossed by the Project.

Informal consultation among the BLM and cooperating agencies, including the FWS has continued throughout the development of the EIS including meetings, conference calls, letters, and other correspondence. In early 2010, the BLM established the BRTG composed of the biologists from the BLM, USFS, FWS, and the state wildlife agencies. The group meets via conference call once a month to discuss the status of the Project, issues, and approach to addressing key biological resource issues.

In early 2011, the FWS, BLM, USFS, BIA, and USACE, federal agencies with the authority and responsibility to perform certain actions associated with the Project, entered into a Consultation Agreement. Additional federal agencies signed the Agreement in 2013 (i.e., URMCC, NPS). The Agreement addresses interagency coordination for the affirmative conservation and recovery of listed species under Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA. Section 7(a)(1) directs all federal agencies to use their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of the ESA by "carrying out programs for the conservation and recovery of listed species." Pursuant to Section 7 (a)(1), the Agreement clarifies agency roles during consultation under Section 7(a)(2) for the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the Proposed Action on listed species, species proposed for listing, and their associated designated or proposed critical habitat. In coordination with appropriate state natural-resource management agencies that have trust authority for nonlisted species, the Agreement also speaks to interagency coordination for the conservation of, and assessment of effects on, candidate species that may be affected by the Proposed Action.

Pursuant to Section 7(c)(1) of the ESA, the BLM, in cooperation with the appropriate cooperating agencies, will prepare a Biological Assessment to initiate formal consultation with the FWS and fulfill agency obligations under Section 7(a)(2) of the Act for the Agency Preferred Alternative route. The BLM will work collaboratively with the FWS to ensure that the FWS has an appropriate amount of time to review the information contained in the Biological Assessment and prepare a Biological Opinion prior to completion of a ROD or irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources by any agency.

Additionally, the Applicant has convened a group of sage-grouse biologists from the BLM and cooperating agencies (the HEA Technical Working Group) to provide input and guidance during the development of the Applicant's Sage-grouse Mitigation Plan, including the HEA component of the HEA. The agency biologists work closely with the Applicant to ensure adequacy of the mitigation analysis and corresponding final product, as well as addressing concerns and questions, developing assumptions for the analysis, and resolving issues as they arise. The HEA Technical Working Group meets as-needed during development of the Sage-grouse Mitigation Plan and HEA.

6.2.2.2 Cultural Resources

Section 106 (16 U.S.C. 470f) of the NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effect of their undertakings on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, historic properties, including those listed on, or eligible for, the NRHP. Regulations for the implementation of Section 106 are defined in 36 CFR Part 800 – Protection of Historic Properties. These regulations define how federal agencies meet their statutory responsibilities as required under the law. The Section 106 process seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns with the needs of federal undertakings through consultation among the agency official and other parties with an interest in the effects of the undertaking on historic properties (36 CFR 800.1). These parties include the ACHP, SHPOs, American Indian tribes, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, state and other federal agencies, and individuals or organizations with a demonstrated interest in the undertaking due to their legal or economic relation to the undertaking or affected properties, or their concern with the effects of undertakings on historic properties (36 CFR 800.2).

As lead federal agency for compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, the BLM initiated Section 106 consultation with the SHPOs, PLPCO, SITLA, USFS, NPS, and ACHP pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.6 and 800.14 (b) of the ACHP's regulations implementing Section 106 of the NHPA in April 2010. The Section 106 process is separate from but often conducted parallel with the preparation of an EIS. To ensure compliance with Section 106, in 2010 the BLM assembled a formal group, the Cultural Resources Task Group (CRTG) , composed of the BLM State Archaeologists from each of the three states and cultural resources specialists from USFS, BIA, NPS, and Utah PLPCO. The CRTG convenes at least once a month. Other agency cultural resources personnel may participate as consultation progresses.

Consultation under Section 106 of the NHPA is ongoing and will continue during post-EIS phases of Project implementation.

The BLM in consultation with the Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah SHPOs agreed to develop a Programmatic Agreement among the various state and federal agencies and consulting parties with an interest in the Project. A Programmatic Agreement outlines the stipulations that will be followed concerning the identification, assessment, and treatment of cultural resources for the Project in accordance with 36 CFR 800.15(b). Signatories agree that the Project will be administered in accordance with stipulations and measures set forth in the Programmatic Agreement. To date, the signatory parties include the BLM, USFS, NPS, three SHPOs, and ACHP. Additional signatory parties, invited signatory parties (e.g., the Applicant), and concurring parties have yet to be determined.

Through the development of a Programmatic Agreement, the BLM and cooperating agencies will outline a phased approach to fulfill the four requirements of Section 106: initiate consultation, identify historic properties, assess adverse effects, and resolve adverse effects. The first step (initiate consultation) requires the BLM to establish the undertaking, identify the appropriate SHPO(s) or Tribal Historic Preservation Office, plan to involve the public, and identify other consulting parties. This step is generally scheduled concurrently with the NEPA scoping efforts. The second step (identify historic properties) requires BLM to determine the scope of the efforts (e.g., the methodologies for each type of cultural resource study, the Project Area of Potential Effects for each study), identify historic properties (Class III intensive pedestrian inventories), and evaluate historic significance (i.e., apply the four NRHP criteria). During the third step, BLM assesses adverse effects on historic properties identified during the previous step. The second and third steps parallel the NEPA processes of drafting the EIS, conducting public hearings/workshops, and finalizing the EIS. The final step in the Section 106 process is the resolution of adverse effects, which will be documented in the HPTP. A copy of the Programmatic Agreement is will be provided in Appendix I of the Final EIS. The Programmatic Agreement will be complete prior to issuance of the ROD; however, stipulations may need to be included in the right-of-way grant requiring completion of agency-approved treatment of historic properties identified by agency archaeologists as needing further investigation before any Project-related ground-disturbing activities commence in the vicinity of the historic properties. If stipulations are included in the right-of-way grant, the Authorized Officer would issue a Notice to Proceed upon satisfactory completion of each investigation.

Government-to-Government and Section 106 Tribal Consultation

The United States has a unique legal relationship with American Indian tribal governments as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, treaties, Executive Orders (e.g., Executive Order 13175), federal statutes, federal policy, and tribal requirements, which establish the interaction that must take place between federal and tribal governments. An important basis for this relationship is the trust responsibility of the United States to protect tribal sovereignty, self-determination, tribal lands, tribal assets and resources, and treaty and other federally recognized and reserved rights. Government-to-government consultation is the process of seeking, discussing, and considering views on policy, and/or, in the case of this Project, environmental and cultural resource management issues. As part of the BLM's on-going government-to-government consultation, tribal officials were informed of the Project and those who expressed interest in the Project will be updated periodically on the status of the Project through the completion of the NEPA process. For efficiency, government-to-government consultation activities often are combined with Section 106 tribal consultation activities. The BIA, a fiduciary for the administration and management of surface land and subsurface minerals estate held in trust by the United States for American Indian tribes and individual Indians, is a cooperating agency involved in the preparation of the EIS and would authorize, with the approving consent of the Ute Indian Tribe, any rights-of-way over lands held in trust from the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation.

Pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.2, the lead federal agency must consult with American Indian tribes that attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by an undertaking. This requirement applies regardless of the location of the historic property. In such cases, the federal agency must notify the tribes potentially affected by the undertaking and give those tribes the opportunity to participate in the Project as a concurring party should they wish to do so.

Federal legislation applicable to tribal consultation in the Project area includes:

- NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470; 36 CFR Part 800), specifically Section 106, directs federal agencies to take into account the effects of their actions on historic properties and provide the tribes a reasonable opportunity to comment.
- ARPA (16 U.S.C. 470aa to 470ee) authorizes federal land-management agencies to manage through a permit process the excavation and/or removal of archaeological resources on federal lands. The land-management agencies must consult with American Indian tribes with interests in resources prior to issuance of permits.
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 1996) requires federal lead agencies and/or federal land-management agencies to consult with affected American Indian tribes regarding federal actions that would pose potential conflicts with freedom to practice traditional American Indian religions.
- NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3002) provides a process through which federal agencies consult with affected Native Americans regarding the treatment and return of human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and items of cultural patrimony identified on federal lands as a result of a federal action.
- Executive Order 13007, issued in 1996, directs federal land-management agencies to accommodate access to, and ceremonial use of, Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners and avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of sacred sites. Where appropriate, agencies will maintain the confidentiality of these sites.
- Executive Order 13175, issued in 2000, charges each federal agency to engage in timely and meaningful consultation and collaboration with Indian tribal governments; strengthen the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian tribes; and reduce the imposition of unfunded mandates upon Indian tribes.
- Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments Memorandum (signed by President Clinton, April 29, 1994), 59 *Federal Register* 22951 (May 4, 1994) directs federal agencies to consult, to the greatest extent practicable and to the extent permitted by law, with tribal governments prior to taking actions that affect federally recognized tribal governments. Federal agencies must assess the impact of federal government plans, projects, programs, and activities on tribal trust resources and ensure that tribal government rights and concerns are considered during such development.
- Secretarial Order 3206, issued in 1997 by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the ESA (16 U.S.C. 1531, as amended), the federal-tribal (i.e., government-to-government) trust relationship, and other federal law. The order directs component agencies of the USDI and the Department of Commerce to carry out their responsibilities under the ESA in a manner that harmonizes the federal trust responsibility to tribes, tribal sovereignty, and statutory missions of the departments, and that strives to ensure the Indian tribes do not bear a disproportionate burden for the conservation of listed species.
- USDI Policy on Consultation with Indian Tribes, outlines the USDI's consultation framework for fulfilling its tribal consultation obligations, including requirements for government-to-government consultation between tribal officials and department officials.

BLM Instruction Memorandum No. 2010-037: Tribal Consultation and Cultural Resource Authorities provides an update on the BLM's tribal outreach initiative, emphasizes the importance of tribal relations and partnerships for the BLM, and discusses revision of the national Programmatic Agreement that the BLM maintains with the ACHP and National Conference of SHPOs. In addition, the SHPO for each state involved (Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah) is responsible for ensuring that laws applicable to tribal consultation are followed on lands under the jurisdiction of the state.

State of Wyoming statutes and guidelines include the following:

- At present, Wyoming has no state statutes pertaining to tribal consultations and/or the handling of inadvertently discovered human Native American remains.

State of Colorado statutes and guidelines include the following:

- Unmarked Human Graves. Discovery of human remains (Colorado Revised Statue 24-80-1302) requires examination of inadvertently discovered human remains within 48 hours of notification to determine if the remains are of forensic value. If the coroner determines that the remains are of no forensic value, then the coroner notifies the State Archaeologist, who makes an examination as soon as possible to determine if the remains are more than 100 years old and if they are Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the State Archaeologist notifies the Secretary of the Colorado Commission Indian Affairs, who in turn notifies interested tribes in the region, via email or mail (by their choice) before removal.
- "Process for Consultation, Transfer and Reburial of Culturally Unidentifiable Native American Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects Originating From Inadvertent Discoveries on Colorado State and Private Lands" is an agreement between the Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs and the Colorado Historical Society that establishes a process for the consultation, repatriation, and reburial of culturally unidentifiable Native American human remains and associated funerary objects inadvertently discovered on private and state lands in Colorado.

State of Utah statutes and guidelines include the following:

- UAC Section 9-9-403 provides a process for the ownership and disposition of Native American human remains discovered on nonfederal lands not state owned.
- UAC Section 76-9-704 provides the definitions and penalties for the abuse or desecration of a dead human body.
- UAC Section R212-4 requires that, if human remains are discovered in conjunction with a project subject to Section 106, the project proponent is responsible for all efforts associated with the excavation, analysis, curation, or repatriation of the human remains and for notifying the Utah SHPO.
- UAC Section 9-8-309 provides a process through which landowners or land-management agencies consult with the state regarding the treatment of human remains discovered on nonfederal lands not state owned.

Early in the NEPA process, BLM in coordination with the federal and state cooperating agencies, identified 33 American Indian tribes that may have a traditional association with the Project area. The BLM initiated contact with American Indian tribes in accordance with various environmental laws and Executive Orders[1]. As part of scoping, the BLM mailed letters, dated April 2011, to the American Indian

[1] NEPA; NHPA, as amended; American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978; NAGPRA, as amended; FLPMA, ARPA of 1979; Executive Order 11593 – Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment; Executive Order 12898 –

tribes listed in Table 6-1 that may have an interest in the Project area to inform them of and determine their interest in the Project.

The BLM received responses from four tribes. The Hopi Tribe responded in April 2011 that the tribe would participate in government-to-government consultation. The Pueblo of Laguna responded in April 2011 that the tribe had no objections to the Project at that time. The Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation informed the BLM in May 2011 that they intend to consult on the Project. In July 2011, the Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation informed the BLM that they intend to consult on the Project. The BLM received no responses from the other 29 tribes.

In March 2012, the same 33 tribes were invited to participate in development of the Project Programmatic Agreement under Section 106 of NHPA and to sign as concurring parties. In April 2012, the tribes were invited to attend a meeting with Consulting Parties conducted by the BLM. The purpose of the meeting was for the BLM to (1) introduce the Project; (2) provide an overview of Section 106 of the NHPA; (3) discuss the purpose, use, and development of a Programmatic Agreement for the Project; (4) explain the Project schedule; and (5) provide those interested an opportunity to affirm their level of interest in the Project. The BLM received responses from four tribes in March 2012. The Hopi Tribe, Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, and Pueblo of Santa Clara all responded that the they intend to participate in the Section 106 process for the Project. The Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Indian Reservations informed the BLM that the tribe defers their Section 106 consultation to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation. The BLM received no responses from the other 29 tribes.

In April 2012, the BLM mailed Project information materials for the April 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties meeting to nine tribes (Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Hopi Tribe, Northern Arapaho Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Pueblo of Santa Clara, Pueblo of Taos, Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, Ute Mountain Ute of the Ute Mountain Reservation, and Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation), based on the proximity of traditional tribal territories to the Project area or confirmation from the tribe that they intend to participate with the BLM in Section 106 consultation. The Hopi Tribe responded, informing the BLM that the tribe did not intend to participate in the meeting. The remaining eight tribes did not respond to the mailing.

On April 23, 2012, the BLM and Applicant met with representatives of the Ute Tribe Energy & Minerals Department, Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce and discuss the Project. Also, the BLM was invited to give a presentation to the TriUte Association on May 31, 2012, to introduce and discuss the Project. The BLM and Ute Tribe agreed to continue coordination.

In April 2013, a letter was sent to the Ute Tribe Energy & Minerals Department providing a status update on the Project and a request for the Ute Tribe to participate as a cooperating agency. A cooperating agency draft MOU was attached to the letter for review and consideration. In addition, a request was made to assist in scheduling a meeting with the Energy & Minerals Department or a meeting with the Business Council to discuss the Project. No response was received.

In May 2013, the BLM sent email messages to the Director, Ute Tribe Cultural Rights and Protection regarding scheduling a meeting to discuss National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultation and draft Programmatic Agreement. No response was received. In July 2013, another email message was sent to the Director to invite the Ute Tribe's participation in a Consulting Parties meeting on July 30,

---

Environmental Justice; Executive Order 13007 – Indian Sacred Sites; Executive Order 13175 – Consultation and Coordination with Indian tribal Governments

2013, in Price, Utah, to review and discuss the Section 106 draft Programmatic Agreement. Attached to the email was the draft Programmatic Agreement for review and comment. No response was received, nor was the Tribe represented at the meeting.

In August 2013, a letter was sent to the Ute Tribal Chairman and Council providing a status update on the Project and a request for the Ute Tribe to participate as a cooperating agency. A cooperating agency draft MOU was attached to the letter for review and consideration. In addition, a request was made to assist in scheduling a meeting with the Tribal Council, Business Council, or both to discuss the Project.

In January 2014, the BLM sent another letter to the Ute Tribal Chairman, with copies to the Tribal Council and heads of the tribal departments, to inform them of the upcoming availability of the Draft EIS (February 2014) and to request a meeting with the Tribal Council and/or Business Council. A chronology of BLM's outreach to the Ute Tribe was included with the letter.

Results of the consultation efforts to date are summarized in Table 6-2 and are documented in the Project administrative record.

The current status of tribal participation is summarized below.

- Thirty-three tribes have been contacted.
- Four tribes (Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Hopi Tribe, Pueblo of Santa Clara, and Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation) have requested consultations.
- One tribe, the Confederate Tribes of the Goshute Indian Reservations, has deferred to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation to represent their interests and concerns regarding the Project during consultation with the BLM.
- As of the date of this Draft EIS, none of the tribes contacted have responded to the BLM's invitation to participate in the development of the Programmatic Agreement as concurring parties.

To date, the BLM has received no substantive comments from the tribes contacted.

6.2.3 Other Coordination

Several federal and state agencies and local governments were consulted during the course of the environmental studies to request data and solicit information and comments. A list of all agency and stakeholder meetings is presented in Appendix C. In addition, information provided by the Applicant on Applicant-initiated public outreach activities is included in Appendix C.

TABLE 6-2 TRIBAL CONTACTS AND CONSULTATION				
	Type of Contact			
	Letters			
Tribe	**April 1, 2011[1]**	**March 2/ April 4, 2012[2]**	**Meetings**	**Response**
Confederate Tribes of the Goshute Indian Reservations	✓	✓		In an email message on March 9, 2012, the tribe deferred to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation to represent their interests and concerns regarding the Project during consultation with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).
Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation	✓	✓		In a letter dated July 5, 2011, the tribe responded to the April 1 letter indicating they intend to participate in government-to-government consultation for the Project.
Hopi Tribe	✓	✓		In a letter dated March 20, 2012, the tribe responded to the March 2 letter that they intend to participate in consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In a letter dated April 25, 2011, the tribe responded they intend to participate in government-to-government consultation for the Project.
Jicarilla Apache Tribe	✓	✓		No response
Navajo Nation	✓	✓		No response
Northern Arapaho Tribe of the Wind River Reservation	✓	✓		No response
Northwestern Band of the Shoshone Nation	✓	✓		No response
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Acoma	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Cochiti	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Isleta	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Jemez	✓	✓		No response

TABLE 6-2 TRIBAL CONTACTS AND CONSULTATION				
	Type of Contact			
	Letters			
Tribe	**April 1, 2011[1]**	**March 2/ April 4, 2012[2]**	**Meetings**	**Response**
Pueblo of Laguna	✓	✓		In a letter dated April 12, 2011, the tribe responded to the April 1, 2011, letter that they had no objection to the Project at that time.
Pueblo of Nambe	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Picuris	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Pojoaque	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of San Felipe	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of San Ildefonso	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of San Juan	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Sandia	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Santa Ana	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Santa Clara	✓	✓		In a letter dated March 28, 2012, the tribe responded to the March 2 letter that they intend to participate in consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act
Pueblo of Santo Domingo	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Taos	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Tesuque	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Zia	✓	✓		No response
Pueblo of Zuni	✓	✓		No response
San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe	✓	✓		No response
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation	✓	✓		No response
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians of Utah	✓	✓		No response
Southern Ute Indian Tribes of Southern Ute Reservation	✓	✓		No response
TriUte Association			May 31, 2012	The BLM was invited by the TriUte Association (i.e., Southern Ute Indian Tribes of Southern Ute Reservation, Ute

TABLE 6-2 TRIBAL CONTACTS AND CONSULTATION				
	Type of Contact			
	Letters			
Tribe	**April 1, 2011[1]**	**March 2/ April 4, 2012[2]**	**Meetings**	**Response**
				Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, and the Ute Mountain Ute of the Ute Mountain Reservation) to give a presentation to introduce and discuss the Project.
Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation	✓	✓	April 23, 2012	In a letter dated January 27, 2012, the BLM offered to give a presentation to the Ute Tribe Business Council and to meet with the Director, Ute Tribe Cultural Rights and Protection. In response, a meeting was arranged for April 23, 2012, in Fort Duchesne with the Ute Tribe Energy & Minerals Department. In follow-up letters dated April 23 and September 3, 2013, the BLM wrote to the Director, Ute Tribe Energy & Minerals Department and Ute Tribal Chairman and Council, respectively, to summarize the outreach with the tribe to date, to invite the tribe's participation as a cooperating agency, and to request a meeting or meetings with the Department, Ute Tribal Council and/or Ute Business Council. On May 28 and July 10, 2013, the BLM followed up with email messages to the Director, Ute Tribe Cultural Rights and Protection requesting a meeting to discuss consultation and the Section 106 draft Programmatic Agreement, and inviting participation in a Consulting Parties meeting to review and discuss the draft Programmatic Agreement.

TABLE 6-2
TRIBAL CONTACTS AND CONSULTATION

Tribe	Type of Contact			Response
	Letters		Meetings	
	April 1, 2011[1]	March 2/ April 4, 2012[2]		
Ute Mountain Ute of the Ute Mountain Reservation	✓	✓		In a letter dated May 3, 2011, the tribe responded to the April 1, 2011, letter that they intend to participate in government-to-government consultation for the Project.

NOTES:
[1]The BLM sent a letter to the tribes to introduce the Project, explain the preparation of the environmental impact statement, and request government-to-government consultation.
[2]By way of the March 2, 2012 letter, the BLM invited the tribes to participate in consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and invited them to participate in a meeting to discuss preparation of the Programmatic Agreement. In the April 4, 2012 letter, the date of and background information for the meeting (on April 11, 2012), was provided.

6.3 Scoping Process

The scoping process is purposefully conducted early in the EIS and land-use planning process and is open to all interested agencies and public. The intent is to solicit comments and identify issues that help direct the approach and depth of the environmental studies and analysis needed to prepare the EIS. Objectives to meet this goal include the following:

- Identify and invite agencies with jurisdiction and/or special expertise relevant to the Project to participate in the preparation of the EIS as cooperating agencies
- Identify other interested parties and invite them to participate in the NEPA process
- Identify other environmental review and consultation requirements
- Identify the relevant and substantive issues that need to be addressed during the studies and in the EIS
- Determine the range of alternatives to be evaluated
- Develop the environmental analysis criteria and systematic process, allocating EIS assignments among agencies, as appropriate

The scoping process is summarized in this section and documented in the *Energy Gateway South Transmission Project EIS Scoping Report* (BLM 2011a), which is available for viewing at the BLM field offices and on the BLM Project website (refer to the following section for its address). The issues derived from scoping comments are listed in Chapter 1, Table 1-1.

6.3.1 Approach

The range of issues summarized in this document was derived from the scoping process and ongoing public involvement. Some of the activities implemented early in the Project are listed below.

- Agency, interagency, and stakeholder meetings (listed in Appendix C) were held to discuss the Project and to solicit comments.
- Announcements to inform the public of the Project, EIS preparation, and public scoping meetings included the *Federal Register* NOI (April 1, 2011), and media releases to local newspapers and radio stations, legal notices, and the Environmental Notification Bulletin Board (ENBB, posted March 2011) .
- A newsletter was distributed to interested parties on the Project mailing list, which includes federal, state, and local government agencies, special interest groups, and individuals—a total of approximately 15,400 parties. The newsletter introduced the Project, solicited input for the environmental analysis, and announced upcoming public scoping meetings.
- The BLM-established Project website contains a brief description of the Project, the purpose of and need for the Project, an EIS timeline, the Draft EIS, newsletters, right-of-way information, geotechnical investigations, scoping reports, maps, and a schedule. A link was provided for the public to submit comments via email at BLM_WY-GatewaySouth@blm.gov. (http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/hdd/gateway_south.html)
- 12 formal scoping meetings were held in May and early June 2011, to introduce the Project, explain the purpose of and need for the Project, describe the Project, explain the planning and permitting process, and solicit comments useful for the environmental analysis.

In addition, the Applicant assembled four community working groups representing diverse interests associated with the Project area. To date, each CWG has met one time to provide input to the Applicant on the Project.

6.3.1.1 Information Dissemination and Notification

Mailing lists maintained by the BLM Rawlins, Rock Springs, Grand Junction, Little Snake, White River, Glenwood Springs, Cedar City, Fillmore, Moab, Price, Salt Lake, Vernal, Richfield Field Offices; and the Ashley, Manti-La Sal, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache, Medicine Bow-Routt, and White River National Forests were compiled along with a list of federal, state, and local agency representatives, community leaders, and potential stakeholders. Ranchers with grazing allotments on lands administered by the BLM and/or USFS and current BLM lease holders, whose contact information was extracted from the LR 2000 database, also were added to the Project mailing list. Other additions included interested organizations and individuals who commented on the Project or requested information. The mailing list is used to distribute scoping announcements and subsequent updates on the status of the Project.

As explained in Section 6.2, information about the Project was disseminated early in the NEPA process through the *Federal Register*, a newsletter, media releases and advertisements, and website postings.

A NOI was published in the *Federal Register* on April 1, 2011 (Vol. 76, No. 63, pages 18241 to 18243), announcing the preparation of the EIS for the proposed Project, and the opportunity for the public to participate in the process and provide input. The publication of the NOI in the *Federal Register* marked the beginning of EIS preparation and the scoping process.

The first in a series of newsletters was mailed by the BLM in March 2011, to approximately 8,100 individuals, agencies, and interested organizations on the Project mailing list. In addition, the Applicant prepared a list of the landowners within a 2-mile-wide corridor along the alternative routes (1 mile on either side of the reference centerline and approximately 7,300 landowners), sent a letter introducing the Project, and encouraged the landowners to participate in the federal scoping process. Media releases and newspaper notices were placed in regional and local newspapers (Table 6-3). Also, the BLM posted Project information and announcement of the meetings on the BLM public website and on the ENBB in mid-March 2011.

TABLE 6-3 PRESS RELEASES AND LEGAL NOTICES	
Newspaper	**Legal Notice Publication Dates**
Mt. Pleasant Pyramid, Sanpete County, Utah	May 19 and 26, 2011
The Moab Times-Independent, Moab, UT	May 19 and 26, 2011
The Times-News, Nephi, Utah	May 11 and 18, 2011
Sun Advocate, Price, Utah	May 17 and 24, 2011
Sanpete Messenger, Sanpete County, Utah	May 11, 18, and 25, 2011
Uintah Basin Standard, Roosevelt, Utah	May 10 and 17, 2011
Vernal Express, Vernal, Utah	May 11 and 18, 2011
Craig Daily Press, Craig, Colorado	May 4 and 11, 2011
Grand Junction Free Press, Grand Junction, Colorado	May 6 and 13, 2011
The Daily Sentinel, Grand Junction, Colorado	May 4 and 11, 2011
Rio Blanco Herald Times, Rio Blanco County, Colorado	May 5 and 12, 2011
The Citizen Telegram, Rifle, Colorado	May 5 and 12, 2011
Emery County Progress, Emery County, Utah	May 17 and 24, 2011
Laramie Boomerang, Laramie, Wyoming	April 26 and May 3, 2011
Rawlins Daily Times, Rawlins Wyoming	April 26 and May 3, 2011
The Rocket-Miner, Rock Springs, Wyoming	April 27 and May 4, 2011
Saratoga Sun, Carbon County, Wyoming	April 27 and May 4, 2011
Snake River Press, Baggs, Wyoming	April 15 and 29, 2011

Scoping Meetings

Twelve scoping meetings were held in May and early June 2011 to inform the public about the Project and the NEPA process and to solicit input on the scope of the Project and potential issues. The scoping meetings were held from 4:30 to 7:30 p.m. at the locations and dates listed below:

Baggs, Wyoming
Tuesday, May 10, 2011

Rock Spring, Wyoming
Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Rawlins, Wyoming
Thursday, May 12, 2011

Craig, Colorado
Tuesday, May 17, 2011

Rangely, Colorado
Wednesday, May 18, 2011

Grand Junction, Colorado
Thursday, May 19, 2011

Roosevelt, Utah
Tuesday, May 24, 2011

Fort Duchesne, Utah
Wednesday, May 25, 2011

Nephi, Utah
Thursday, May 26, 2011

Price, Utah
Tuesday, May 31, 2011

Mount Pleasant, Utah
Wednesday, June 1, 2011

Green River, Utah
Thursday, June 2, 2011

An open-house format was used for the meetings. Handouts at the meetings included a Project map, the initial newsletter, and comment form. Several information display stations were positioned around the meeting room to help explain the purpose of and need for the Project, Project description (including Project maps), environmental studies and analyses to be completed, NEPA process timeline, cooperating agencies, how to submit comments, and scoping meeting dates and locations. One station in the meeting room was equipped with an automated, 3-dimensional "virtual tour" of the alternative routes. Those individuals interested could view the virtual tour along one or more of the alternative routes. Another station was attended by the Applicant's realty agents who were able to answer landowner questions about the location of the alternative routes in relation to their properties. Another station was equipped with two computers loaded with the form developed to document comments from individuals. Representatives from the BLM, the Applicant, and the third-party environmental consulting team assisting the BLM, EPG, were present and available to explain the displays, answer questions, and assist in accepting and recording comments. A total of 231 members of the public attended the scoping meetings.

Written comments were accepted at the public scoping meetings, via electronic mail, and via U.S. mail at the BLM Wyoming State Office. Although the publication of the NOI initiated a 90-day public scoping period, scoping comments were accepted until June 30, 2011, 28 days after the last public scoping meeting.

6.3.2 Scoping Results

The public scoping process and results of scoping efforts are documented in the *Energy Gateway South Transmission Project EIS Scoping Report* (BLM 2011a), which is available for viewing on the BLM Project website. Availability of the Scoping Report was announced through the second in a series of newsletters sent to all parties on the Project mailing list and on the BLM Project website. A summary of the issues derived from comments received are listed in Chapter 1, Table 1-1.

6.3.3 Public Review of the Environmental Impact Statement and Land-use Plan Amendments

The BLM announced the availability of this Draft EIS and LUPAs for review and comment through a BLM *Federal Register* NOA, press releases, newspaper notices, Project newsletters, and the BLM Project website. Also, a newsletter announcing the availability of the Draft EIS was sent to parties on the Project mailing list. The EPA NOA in the *Federal Register* marks the beginning of the 90-day review and comment period. The Draft EIS and LUPAs was posted on the Project website and electronic copies were produced on CD-ROM for distribution. The Draft EIS and LUPAs has been distributed to agencies required to review the Draft EIS and LUPAs, and to other agencies, organizations, and individuals that requested copies.

During the 90-day review and comment period, 11 public meetings will be held for the BLM to receive comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIS and LUPAs. The meetings will be held in Baggs, and Rawlins, Wyoming, Craig, Rangely, and Grand Junction, Colorado, and Roosevelt, Fort Duchesne, Nephi, Price, Mount Pleasant, and Green River, Utah. The meetings will be conducted to provide ample opportunity for the public to comment on the Draft EIS and LUPAs. Dates and addresses of the public meetings will be announced through a Project newsletter, through local and news media, and listed on the Project website: http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/hdd/gateway_south.html at least 15 days in advance of the meetings.

All written comments must be received within 90 days after the NOA was published by the EPA in the *Federal Register*. Comments on the Draft EIS and LUPAs may be submitted verbally or in writing at the scheduled public open house meetings or in writing by letter or electronic mail to the BLM (as instructed in the letter to the readers at the beginning of this document).

Comments, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be available for public review at the BLM, Wyoming State Office, 5353 Yellowstone Road, Cheyenne, Wyoming, during regular business hours (7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays and may be published as part of the Final EIS.

Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or street address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comment(s). Such requests will be honored to the extent allowable by law.

All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety. The BLM will not consider anonymous comments.

6.3.4 Final Environmental Impact Statement and Land-use Plan Amendments

All written and oral comments on the Draft EIS and LUPAs received during the 90-day period will be compiled and analyzed, and responses will be prepared for inclusion in the Final EIS and Proposed LUPAs. A *Federal Register* NOA of the Final EIS and Proposed LUPAs will be published, which will contain information about the Project and the 30-day availability period for the Final EIS and concurrent 30-day protest period for the Proposed LUPAs and filing instructions. Also, the BLM will provide a 60-day review period to the Governors of the states in which LUPAs are being proposed to ensure consistency with state and local plans, policies, and programs. The availability and protest periods and Governors' consistency review will occur simultaneously. Any responses from a Governor on consistency must be resolved before RODs are issued.

The BLM and USFS will each issue a ROD and other affected federal agencies with decisions to make may each issue a ROD summarizing the findings and decisions regarding the preferred alternative for the Proposed Action and its determination regarding compliance with NEPA and other regulations. Also, the RODs will document the management decisions made regarding applicable amendments to land-use plans.

6.4 Applicant-initiated Activities

Four community working groups, created to provide a forum for input into the transmission line siting studies, consisted of representatives from cities, counties, and stakeholders in the northern and southern portions of the Project area. While the community working groups are not decision-making entities, members were asked to provide feedback on the Project and consider the views of the group, as well as the views of their respective organizations and/or communities. To date, the community working groups have each met one time. The first meetings were held in September 2012 in Rawlins, Wyoming; and Salt Lake City, Nephi, and Price, Utah. The purpose was to (1) introduce the proposed Project, (2) gather input regarding the scope of the Project and alternative routes, and (3) identify issues that would help the Applicant in developing the transmission line. The Applicant anticipates another set of meetings will be conducted after the Draft EIS and LUPAs is issued for review and comment.

In addition, the Applicant posted a general description of the Project on their communications website (www.pacificorp.com/transmission) and conducted briefings of community leaders to introduce and continue to keep them informed about the Project. A list of additional community outreach meetings is included in Appendix C.

In addition, the Applicant will continue to provide updates and information regarding the Project to all the counties and cities that require conditional use permits and general plan amendments.

6.5 Preparers and Contributors

Preparers, contributors, and consultants involved throughout the Project (including BLM and USFS staff), are listed in Tables 6-4, 6-5, and 6-6.

TABLE 6-4
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

Name	Title	Involvement
Bureau of Land Management		
Project Management		
Tamara Gertsch	National Project Manager	Project management and coordination
Scott Whitesides		National Transmission Support Team (NTST) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Support
Christine Pontarolo	Biologist	NTST Biological Resources Support
Jenna Gaston	Cultural Resources Specialist	NTST Cultural Resources Support
Beverly Gorny	Public Affairs Specialist Project Assistant	Public affairs
Tamera Hammack	Web Specialist	Website maintenance
Wyoming		
Wyoming State Office		
Brent Breithaupt	Regional Paleontologist	Paleontological resources
Ranel Capron	State Archaeologist Project Lead – Cultural Resources	Cultural resources
Christopher Carlton	Planning and NEPA	NEPA compliance review
Sherry Lahti	State Program Lead – Visual Resource Management	Visual resources
Pamela Murdock	Branch Chief, Planning and Environmental Coordination	NEPA and planning support
Dennis Saville	Project Lead – Wildlife	Wildlife resources
Janelle Wrigley	State Program Lead – Realty	Project management, lands, access
Mary Wilson	Chief, Office of Communications	State Project Lead, external communications
Rawlins Field Office		
Ron Biegel	Realty Specialist	Lands and realty
Frank Blomquist	Wildlife Biologist Project Lead – Wildlife	Wildlife resources
Bonni Bruce	Supervisory Archaeologist State Project Lead – Cultural Resources	Cultural resources
Mike Calton	Range Management Specialist	Wild horses and burros
Dennis Carpenter	Field Manager	
Robert Epp	Range Management Specialist	Livestock grazing
Bruce Estvold	Civil Engineer	
Susan Foley	Soil Scientist	Earth resources, vegetation

TABLE 6-4 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	**Title**	**Involvement**
Martha Hemphill	Archaeologist	Cultural resources
David Hullum	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, visual resources
Lynn McCarthy	Geographic Information System (GIS) Specialist	GIS
Mark Newman	Geologist	Earth resources
Kelly Owens	Hydrologist	Water resources
Richard Putnam	Fire/Fuels Specialist	Fire/Fuels
John Russell	RECO Project Manager	
Heather Schultz	RECO Project Manager	Field Office Point of Contact, lands and realty
Colorado		
Colorado State Office		
Maryanne Kurtinaitis	Renewable Energy program Manager	State Point of Contact
Northwest District Office		
Jim Cagney	Northwest District Manager	
David Rosenkrance	Associate District Manager	
Grand Junction Field Office		
Doug Diekman	Information Technology (IT) Specialist	GIS
Jim Dollerschell	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range, wild horses
Collin Ewing	Planning and NEPA Specialist	NEPA and planning support
Scott Gerwe	Geologist	Minerals, paleontology, groundwater
Lathan Johnson	Fire/Fuels Specialist	Fire/Fuels
Erin Dreyfuss Jones	NEPA Coordinator	Field Office Point of Contact
Alyssa A. Levitt-Reynolds	Archaeologist	Cultural resources
Anna Lincoln	Ecologist	Range, threatened and endangered plants
Heidi Plank	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, threatened and endangered wildlife
Christina Stark	Natural Resource Specialist	Lands and realty
Katie Stevens	Field Manager	
Mark Taber	Natural Resource Specialist	Weeds
Cathy Ventling	Natural Resource Specialist	Natural resources
Little Snake Field Office		
Desa Ausmus	State Project Lead – Wildlife	Wildlife
Pam Levitt	IT Specialist (GIS)	GIS
Kathy McKinstry	Environmental Coordinator	NEPA and planning support
Louise McMinn	Realty Specialist	Field Office Point of Contact, lands and realty
Jimmy Michels	Fire/Fuels Specialist	Fire/Fuels
Wendy Reynolds	Field Manager	
Gina Robison	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, travel management, visual resource management, wilderness
Kim Ryan	Archaeologist	Cultural resources
Hunter Seim	Lead Rangeland Management Specialist	Range
Emily Spencer	Ecologist	Soil, water, air
White River Field Office		
Lisa Belmonte	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, threatened and endangered animals, riparian
Richard Brooks	IT Specialist	GIS

TABLE 6-4 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	**Title**	**Involvement**
Janet Doll	Realty Specialist	Field Office Point of Contact, lands and realty
Matt Dupire	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range, vegetation, noxious weeds
Baili Foster	Seasonal Ecologist	Special designation and other management areas
Melissa Kindall	Range Technician	Wild horse
Bob Lange	Hydrologist	Soil, water, air
Ester McCullough	Associate Field Manager	
Jimmy Michels	Fire/Fuels Specialist	Fire/Fuels
Heather Sauls	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	NEPA and planning support
Chad Schneckenburger	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, visual resource management, travel management
Michael Selle	Archaeologist	Cultural resources, paleontology
Kent Walter	Field Manager	
Heather Woodruff	Range Management Specialist	Special status plants
Utah		
Utah State Office		
Lola Bird	External affairs	
Shauna Derbyshire	Realty Specialist	State Project Lead, lands and realty
Carla Garrison	IT Specialist	GIS
Jeremy Jarnecke	Hydrologist	Hydrology
Pamela Jarnecke	Branch Chief, Planning and Environmental Coordination	Project Lead, NEPA and planning support
Byron Loosle	Archaeologist State Project Lead – Cultural Resources	Cultural resources
Whitney May	Visual Resource Management Specialist	Visual resources
Robin Naeve	Biologist	State Project Lead, wildlife
Jeremy Sisneros	Fire/Fuels Specialist	Fire/Fuels
Rob Sweeten	Landscape Architect Visual Resource Management Specialist, National Scenic and Historic Trails	State Project Lead, visual resources, National Scenic and Historic Trails
Color Country District		
Todd Christensen	District Manager	
Randy Trujillo	Associate District Manager	
West Desert District		
Kevin Oliver	District Manager	
David Whitaker	Emergency Stabilization and Reclamation Coordinator	Vegetation, threatened and endangered plants
Fillmore Field Office		
Gary Bishop	Assistant Fire Management Officer	Fire prevention
Steven Bonar	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs), wilderness
Paul Caso	Rangeland Management Specialist	Air quality, range, floodplains, water rights, water quality
Michael Gates	Field Manager	
Chad Kunz		Roads, facilities

TABLE 6-4 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	**Title**	**Involvement**
Cindy Ledbetter	Environmental Coordinator	
Jerry Mansfield	Geologist	Paleontology, minerals, energy resources
Joelle McCarthy	Assistant Field Manager Non-Renewables, Archaeologist	
R.B. Probert	Bio Science Tech (Plants)	Range, weeds
Eric Reid	Assistant Field Manager Renewables	Renewables
Clara Stevens	Realty Specialist	Field Office Point of Contact, lands and realty
Russell Tanner	Archaeologist	Cultural resources, tribal consultation, historic trails
Bill Thompson	Rangeland Management Specialist	Wetlands, riparian, farmlands, vegetation
Moab Field Office		
Ann Marie Aubry	Hydrologist	Hydrology, riparian areas
Jean Carson	GIS Specialist	GIS
Jordan Davis	Rangeland Management Specialist	Weeds
Jan Denney	Realty Specialist	Field Office Point of Contact, lands and realty
Rebecca Doolittle	Geologist	Geology, minerals, soils
Aron King	Archaeologist	Cultural resources, tribal consultation
Don Montoya	Archaeologist	Cultural resources, tribal consultation
Pam Riddle	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, special status species
Bill Stevens	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness, WSR, socioeconomics
Katie Stevens	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, ACECs
Doug Wight	GIS Specialist	GIS
David Williams	Range Management Specialist	Range
Price Field Office		
Patricia Clabaugh	Field Manager	
Karl Ivory	Rangeland Management Specialist	NRS, threatened and endangered plants
Floyd Johnson	Planner	NEPA and planning
Amber Koski	Archaeologist	Cultural resources
Don Kranendonk	Assistant Field Manager	
Connie Leschin	Realty Specialist	Field Office Point of Contact, lands and realty
Ahmed Mohsen	Associate Field Manager	NEPA and planning
Tyler Nelson	GIS Specialist	GIS
Jared Reese	Natural Resource Specialist	Wildlife biology
Richfield Field Office		
Jason Anderson	GIS Specialist	
Stan Anderson	Field Manager	
Dona Bastian		Wild horses
Bob Bate		Forestry, fire
Chris Colton	Assistant Field Manager, Range	
Jennifer Evans	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, visual resource management, ACECs, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, natural areas
Larry Greenwood	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, special status species
Myron Jeffs	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, visual resource management, ACECs, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, natural areas

TABLE 6-4 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	**Title**	**Involvement**
Joe Manning	Geologist	Geology, paleontology
Michael Utley	Realty Specialist	Field Office Point of Contact, lands and realty
Wayne Wetzel	Field Manager	
Burke Williams	Natural Resource Specialist	Weeds, range
Phil Zieg	Soil Conservationist	Air, water quality
Salt Lake Field Office		
Traci Allen	Biologist	
Mike Nelson	Field Manager, Realty Specialist	Lands and realty
Pam Schuller	Environmental Coordinator	
Dave Watson	Realty Specialist	Field Office Point of Contact, lands and realty
Vernal Field Office		
Cameron Cox	Archaeologist	Cultural resources
Daniel Emmett	Biologist	State Project Lead – Wildlife
Elizabeth Gamber	Geologist	Paleontology
Robin Hansen	Petroleum Engineer	Minerals, energy resources
James Hereford	Natural Resource Specialist Environmental Scientist	
Stephanie Howard	NEPA Specialist	NEPA and planning
Jerry Kenczka	Assistant Field Manager Minerals	
Maggie Martson	Range Management Specialist	Range management
Cindy McKee	Realty Specialist	Field Office Point of Contact, lands and realty
Stan Olmstead		Range, water quality
David Palmer	Forester	Forestry
Aaron Roe	Botanist	Botany, weeds, and vegetation
Michael Stiewig	Field Manager	
Steve Strong	Natural Resource Specialist	Soils
Jason West	Natural Resource Specialist	Recreation, visual resource management, wilderness, ACECs, wild and scenic rivers
Bureau of Land Management National Operations Center		
David Maxwell	Air quality Specialist	Air quality support
Karla Rogers	Visual Resource Management	Visual resources support
Josh Sidon	Socioeconomist	Social and economic conditions support
U.S. Department of the Interior Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance		
David Sire	Regional Environmental Officer	NEPA
Robert Stewart	Regional Environmental Officer	NEPA
Lisa Treichel	Regional Environmental Officer	NEPA

TABLE 6-5 U.S. FOREST SERVICE PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	**Title**	**Involvement**
Kelsha Anderson	Soil Scientist	Soils
Scott Bingham	Ashley National Forest	Point of Contact (Forest)
Kenton Call	Project Lead	Project management
Joe DiBenedetto	Paleontologist	Paleontology
Kevin Draper	Landscape Architect	Visual resources
Rick Dustin	Landscape Architect	Visual resources
Mike Fracasso	Paleontologist	Paleontology
Anne Hansen	Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest	Project Point of Contact (Forest)
Melissa Hearst	Intermountain Region	Project Point of Contact (Region)
Chad Hermandorfer	Hydrologist (TEAMS)	Water resources
Marian Jacklin	Archaeologist	Cultural resources
Jenna Jorgensen	Wildlife Biologist	
Nate Lewis	Environmental Coordinator	Recreation, lands, special uses, and roadless areas
Tom Lloyd	Manti-La Sal National Forest	Project Point of Contact (Forest)
Chris Mease	Fisheries Biologist (TEAMS)	Fisheries
Tim Metzger	Fire Specialist (AMSET)	Fire/Fuels
Terry Miller	Botanist (TEAMS)	Plants
Andrew Orlemann	Silviculturalist (TEAMS)	Forestry
Cheryl Probert	Deputy Forest Supervisor, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache national Forest	Forest Service Authorized Officer
David Ream	Intermountain Region	Project Point of Contact (Region)
Charlie Rosier	Recreation Specialist	Recreation, lands, and special uses
Lucretia Smith	GIS Coordinator, Range Specialist (TEAMS)	GIS, range
Stacey Weems	Soil Scientist	Soils
Josh Wilson	NEPA Specialist (AMSET)	NEPA and planning support

TABLE 6-6 CONSULTANT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	**Education**	**Involvement**
Environmental Planning Group (EPG)		
Ryan Baum	MS, Geographic Information Sciences BS, Biology	Geographic Information Systems
Timothy G. Baumann, CWB	MS, Wildlife Biology BS, Biology	Vegetation resources, special status plants, wildlife, special status wildlife, and fish and aquatic resources
Louise Brown	BS, Administrative Systems	Document management, editor
Suzy Cavanagh	MS, Geology BS, Biology	Earth resources and paleontological resources
Jennifer Streeter	MS, Geography BS, Geography	Geographic Information Systems
John Curl	BS, Public Lands Policy	Biological resources, supporting information
Brian Doubek	BS, Earth Science (Geography)	Geographic Information Systems
Michael Doyle	MLA, Landscape Architecture BS, Environmental Design	Principal-in-charge, technical review

TABLE 6-6 CONSULTANT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	**Education**	**Involvement**
Megan Dunford	MLA, Landscape Architecture BA, Advertising and Interpersonal Communications	Land use and recreation
Thomas J. Ersfeld	BA, International Political Economy	Document preparation , bibliography
Nate Ferguson	BLA, Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning	Visual resources and environmental planning
Naia George	MS, Anthropology BS, Anthropology	Cultural and historical resources
Lynne Gilbert-Norton, PhD	PhD, Wildlife Biology MS, Psychology – Animal Behavior BS, Psychology	Wildlife resources
Gena Huffman	MS, Anthropology BA, Political Science and Anthropology	Cultural and historical resources
Sally Jurin	MS, Education BA, Grammar	Technical editor
Jonathan Knight	BS, Geography	Geographic Information Systems
Mike McConnell	BS, Wildlife Resources	Water resources, fish and aquatic resources
Sarah Nelson	MLA, Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning BA, Anthropology	Geographic Information System
Amanda O'Connor	MS, Conservation Studies BA, Environmental Biology	Senior technical review, NEPA and planning coordination
Mike Pasenko	MS, Quaternary Sciences Program BA, Anthropology	Earth and water resources, paleontology
Mary Pendergast, PhD	PhD, Ecology and Biology BS, Chemistry and Biology	Special status wildlife resources
Reid Persing	BA, Chemistry and Biochemistry	Vegetation and special status plant resources
Scott Peters	BLA, Landscape Architecture	Access roads and disturbance
Kevin Rauhe	BLA, Landscape Architecture	Visual resources
Matt Sauter	MS, Paleontology BA, Geology	Earth and water resources, paleontology
Marc Schwartz	BS, Forestry/Ecosystem Management	Visual resources
Chris Smith	BA, History MLA, Landscape Architecture	Project coordination
Cindy Smith	BS, Liberal Arts and Sciences	Project management
Linwood Smith	PhD, Zoology MS, Zoology BA, Zoology	Wildlife biology and vegetation resources
Danielle Stevens	BA, English BS, Environmental Science	Technical editor
Jan Summerhays	MS, Ecology BA, Environmental Studies	Vegetation and special status plants
Marty Thomas	BA, English BA, Anthropology	Cultural and historical resources
Nikki Wallenta	BS, Land Use Planning	Land use and recreation
Heather Weymouth	MS, American Studies (Anthropology) BIS, Anthropology	Cultural and historical resources

TABLE 6-6 CONSULTANT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	**Education**	**Involvement**
Scott Woods	BS, Geography and Urban/ Environmental Planning	Geographical Information Systems
Andrew T. Yentsch	MS, Anthropology (Archaeology/Human Evolutionary Ecology) BA, History	Cultural and historical resources
Subconsultants		
Louis Berger Group		
Holly Bender	PhD, Mineral Economics MS, Mineral Economics BA, Political Science and Economics	Socioeconomics and environmental justice
Lisa McDonald	PhD, Mineral Economics MS, Mineral Economics BS, Earth Science	Socioeconomics and environmental justice
Wind River Environmental Group, LLC		
Martha Hyder, PhD	PhD, Earth Science/Bioclimatology MS, Earth Science/Bioclimatology BS, Biology	Air quality and Clean Water Act conformity analysis
Exponent		
William H. Bailey	PhD, Neuropsychology	Electric and Magnetic Fields
Joshua Phinney	PhD, Electrical Engineering SM, Electrical Engineering BS, Electrical Engineering BA, Ancient and Classical Languages, Philosophy	Electric and magnetic fields, noise