

6.0 Consultation and Coordination

This EIS was conducted in accordance with NEPA requirements, CEQ regulations, and the USDO and BLM policies and procedures for implementing NEPA. NEPA and the associated laws, regulations, and policies require BLM and Western to seek public input and initiate agency consultation early and throughout the planning process to identify issues and develop a reasonable range of alternatives to ensure that environmental documents appropriately disclose the potential impacts of alternatives considered. Public involvement and agency consultation and coordination, which are at the heart of the process leading to this EIS, were achieved through *Federal Register* notices, public and informal meetings, individual contacts, media releases, and the Project website. This chapter outlines the consultation and coordination process for the proposed Project, including the general public as well as Tribal governments, and federal, state, and local agencies and organizations.

6.1 Public Involvement and Scoping

6.1.1 Public Involvement

NEPA requires full disclosure and open public participation in the federal decision making process, including those projects proposed by non-federal applicants that require federal approval. There are two key points during the development of an EIS when the general public is invited to participate in the process: 1) during the scoping period and 2) during the public comment period following the NOA of the Draft EIS.

The BLM and Western accepted written comments throughout all stages of environmental review of the Project. Summaries of the public comments received during scoping are included in the Scoping Report (BLM and Western 2011), and are available online on the BLM webpage (<http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/hdd/transwest.html>). The issues and concerns identified by the public are summarized in Section 1.8 of the Scoping Report and included in the Draft EIS, **Appendix L** of this Final EIS.

The release of the Draft EIS was followed by a 90-day public comment period. Comments received were reviewed and substantive comments received a response. Substantive comments and corresponding responses are provided as an appendix to the Final EIS. Comments were used to modify, clarify, and/or correct the Final EIS as appropriate.

6.1.2 Scoping Period

The following sections describe the pre-scoping and scoping process following TransWest's amended 2010 ROW application submission and the BLM's and Western's publication of the NOI in the *Federal Register* on January 4, 2011.

The BLM and Western conducted pre-scoping activities following the January 2010 SF 299 ROW application submittal. During the spring of 2010, comments were received from the interdisciplinary team, BLM FOs, USFS, and the cooperating agencies. These comments were considered in developing the alternative corridors presented to the public during the scoping period.

In addition to the brief summary of scoping found in Section 1.7, this section describes the public scoping process, including techniques used to notify the public about the opportunity to comment at this stage in the NEPA process.

6.1.2.1 Scoping Announcements

The initial step in the NEPA process is to notify the public, other government agencies, and tribes of the lead agency's intent to prepare an EIS. The scoping period was announced using a variety of tools:

- **Federal Register** – The BLM and Western published the NOI in the *Federal Register* on January 4, 2011.
- **Newsletters** – a Project newsletter was mailed to approximately 23,000 interested parties including federal, state, and local agencies, and tribes as well as potentially affected landowners within the proposed 2-mile-wide corridors for the proposed and alternative routes.
- **Advertisements** – BLM and Western placed display advertisements in local newspapers and Public Service Announcements were submitted for broadcast on local radio and television announcing the public meetings.
- **News Releases** – BLM Public Affairs personnel from each of the BLM FOs and Western Public Affairs personnel were contacted as a part of the Media Plan to identify the appropriate media outlets and optimum time for conducting a public meeting in their area. The information was compiled and used to schedule the public scoping meetings and media placement for notification.
- **Public Libraries** – The BLM compiled materials and information to be presented at the scoping meetings into three-ring binders and on January 21, 2011, distributed it for public access and review to 23 public libraries located in communities where scoping meetings would be held.
- **BLM TransWest Express Transmission Project Website** – The BLM established a Project website for the proposed Project. The website was initially used to notify the public of the scoping meetings and provide general Project overview information, as well as information on how to provide comments to the BLM regarding the proposed Project. The website currently serves as the electronic NEPA-related Project information source for all aspects and stages of the Project's NEPA process. The website address is: <http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/hdd/transwest.htm>.

6.1.2.2 Scoping Meetings

Public scoping meetings offer an opportunity for the public to participate in the Project and interface directly with agency personnel. The meetings promote information exchange about the proposed Project and an opportunity to gather public input on the issues, impacts, and potential alternatives that will be addressed in an EIS. The BLM and Western hosted 23 public scoping meetings near the proposed Project and alternative routes with a total attendance of 678 individuals. These meetings were conducted as informal open houses to allow for an open exchange of information and to provide the attendees the opportunity to ask agency personnel, the Project Applicant, and the EIS contractor questions about the proposed Project. Once attendees signed in to record their attendance, they were invited to review information about the proposed Project and the NEPA process at seven information stations. A list of meeting locations and dates is listed below (**Table 6-1**).

During the scoping period, BLM and Western met with representatives of several County Commissions. The meetings were scheduled to coincide with the scoping meeting in their respective county. The meetings provided Project information and explained the EIS process. Packets containing the materials available to the public at the scoping meetings were distributed to the Commissioners. In addition to the County Commissioners, BLM and Western met with the Clark County, Nevada Conservation Program on March 1, 2011.

Table 6-1 Public Scoping Meeting Dates and Locations

Meeting Location	Meeting Date
Vernal, Utah	Tuesday, January 25, 2011
Craig, Colorado	Wednesday, January 26, 2011
Rangely, Colorado	Thursday, January 27, 2011
Grand Junction, Colorado	Monday, January 31, 2011
Moab, Utah	Tuesday, February 1, 2011
Castle Dale, Utah	Wednesday, February 2, 2011
Duchesne, Utah	Monday, February 7, 2011
Nephi, Utah	Tuesday, February 8, 2011
Delta, Utah	Wednesday, February 9, 2011
Richfield, Utah	Monday, February 14, 2011
Milford, Utah	Tuesday, February 15, 2011
Cedar City, Utah	Wednesday, February 16, 2011
St. George, Utah	Thursday, February 17, 2011
Pine Valley, Utah	Tuesday, February 22, 2011
Central, Utah	Wednesday, February 23, 2011
Enterprise, Utah	Thursday, February 24, 2011
Caliente, Nevada	Monday, February 28, 2011
Overton (Moapa Valley), Nevada	Tuesday, March 1, 2011
Henderson, Nevada	Wednesday, March 2, 2011
Las Vegas, Nevada	Thursday, March 3, 2011
Rawlins, Wyoming	Tuesday, March 8, 2011
Rock Springs, Wyoming	Wednesday, March 9, 2011
Baggs, Wyoming	Thursday, March 10, 2011

6.1.2.3 Scoping Comments

During the public scoping period, the BLM and Western received a total of 622 comment submittals (e.g., letter, comment form, email) containing 2,319 individual comments. These comments were electronically submitted at the GIS comment station at the meetings, through the BLM Project website, or by U.S. Mail. Following the close of the public scoping period, comments were compiled and analyzed to identify issues and concerns. Within each comment submittal, individual comments were identified, reviewed, and entered into an electronic database.

6.1.3 Draft EIS Comment Period

The BLM and Western released the Draft EIS for a 90-day public comment period, as announced by publishing a NOA in the *Federal Register* on July 3, 2013. The following section outlines the methods used to notify the public and gather input.

6.1.3.1 Draft EIS Announcements

The Draft EIS review period was announced using the same or similar methods as were used during scoping:

- **Federal Register** – The BLM published the NOA in the *Federal Register* on July 3, 2013.
- **Newsletters** – Five newsletters were mailed to approximately 23,000 interested parties including federal, state, and local agencies, and tribes as well as potentially affected landowners. The newsletter dated July 10, 2013, identified meeting dates and locations for the Draft EIS. An announcement of all meeting dates also was emailed to all cooperating agencies.
- **News Releases** – BLM and Western Public Affairs Officers distributed two news releases with information about public comment opportunities: the first on the NOA publication date, the second on August 1, 2013, announcing the public meeting schedule.
- **Postcard** – A postcard was sent to the approximately 5,900 ROW holders along the proposed Project or its alternatives. The postcard included information about the public review period and included the BLM project website location.
- **Advertisements** – BLM and Western placed display advertisements in local newspapers, and Public Service Announcements were submitted for broadcast on local radio and television announcing the public meetings.
- **BLM TransWest Express Transmission Project Website** – The BLM project website posted a list of public meetings and methods of public comment.
- **USFS Announcements** – Pursuant to changes in the administrative review process for USFS projects as codified in 36 CFR 215 and 218. The USFS released a *Federal Register* notice on December 7, 2013, that formally adopted the Draft EIS, provided notice that the proposed decision would be subject to the USFS predecisional review process, and opened a 45-day public comment period. Legal notices to this effect were placed on December 17 or 18, 2013, in the six major newspapers that serve the communities near the five national forests potentially affected by the Project.

6.1.3.2 Draft EIS Public Meetings

The BLM and Western hosted a series of 13 public meetings/hearings throughout the areas crossed by the proposed Project and alternative routes to provide information on the proposed Project and the Draft EIS. Each meeting contained informational displays about the EIS process and schedule, Project locational maps, impacts to resources, and potential land use plan amendments and provided a station for people to provide written and oral comments on the Draft EIS. Attendees had the opportunity to have their verbal comments transcribed by a court reporter for the public record.

Public meetings were held in August and September 2013, from 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm on the dates and at the locations listed in **Table 6-2**.

Table 6-2 Draft EIS Public Meeting Dates and Locations

Date (2013)	City, State	Location	Address
Wed, Aug 14	Rawlins, WY	Jeffrey Center	315 West Pine St.
Thurs, Aug 15	Baggs, WY	Valley Community Center	255 West Osborne
Fri, Aug 16	Craig, CO	Colorado NW Community College	2801 West 9th St.
Tues, Aug 20	Nephi, UT	Juab County Courthouse, Cultural Hall	160 North Main
Wed, Aug 21	Delta, UT	Millard School District Office	285 East 450 North
Mon, Aug 26	Ft. Duchesne, UT	Tribal Auditorium	1400 South 7002 East
Tues, Aug 27	Vernal, UT	Western Park Convention Center	302 East 200 South
Wed, Aug 28	Duchesne, UT	Duchesne High School	155 West Main St.
Thurs, Aug 29	Price, UT	Carbon County Event Center	310 S. Fairgrounds Rd.

Table 6-2 Draft EIS Public Meeting Dates and Locations

Date (2013)	City, State	Location	Address
Tues, Sept 3	Henderson, NV	Heritage Park Senior Facility	300 S. Racetrack Rd.
Wed, Sept 4	Panaca, NV	Neldon C. Matthews Auditorium	1028 Edwards St.
Thurs, Sept 5	Cedar City, UT	Cedar City Middle School	2215 Royal Hunte Dr.
Fri, Sept 6	St. George, UT	Dixie State University, Zion Room	225 South 700 East

6.1.3.3 Draft EIS Public Comments

The BLM and Western received a total of 453 individual comment submittals (e.g., letter, comment form, email, or court reporter transcription). Additionally there were 109 submittals that contained all or portions of one of the four form letters that were submitted for the Project. Following the close of the Draft EIS public comment period, comments were compiled and analyzed to identify issues and concerns. Within each comment submittal, individual comments were identified, reviewed, and entered into an electronic database. The comment analysis process resulted in approximately 1,963 substantive comments requiring responses. The USFS received two comment submittals during their separate comment period. The comment analysis process resulted in 28 additional substantive comments requiring responses, all of which also were represented in the comments received during the BLM/Western comment period. In preparing the Final EIS, the BLM and Western considered all comments. **Appendix L** contains each unique substantive comment received, and its associated response. **Appendix L** also contains a description of the comment analysis and response process.

6.2 Agency Participation and Coordination

Specific regulations require the BLM to coordinate and consult with federal, state, and local agencies about the potential of the proposed Project and alternatives to affect sensitive environmental and human resources. The BLM initiated these coordination and consultation activities through the scoping process and has maintained them through regular meetings regarding key topics with cooperating agencies throughout the NEPA process.

The BLM and Western invited interested federal, state, and county governments to participate as cooperating agencies for the preparation of the Project EIS. To date, 49 agencies and 2 tribes have accepted the invitation. The coordination and consultation must occur in a timely manner and are required before any final decisions are made. Issues related to agency consultation include biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, and land and water management.

6.2.1 Federal and State Agencies

6.2.1.1 Federal Agencies

The BLM and Western are in contact with the following federal agencies:

- Bureau of Indian Affairs, Western Region, representing:
 - Rocky Mountain Region, Billings, MT
 - Southwest Region, Albuquerque, NM
- Bureau of Reclamation, Lower Colorado Region
- National Park Service,
 - Intermountain Region, Lakewood, Colorado
 - Pacific West Region, San Francisco, California

- Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Navy Region Southwest, San Diego, California (managing entity of Nellis AFB)
- Nevada Army National Guard
- U.S. Army, Region 8
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
 - South Pacific Division
 - Northwestern Division
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representing:
 - Mountain Prairie Region, Lakewood, Colorado
 - Pacific Southwest Region, Sacramento, California
- U.S. Forest Service, Intermountain Region, Ogden, Utah (representing the Ashley, Dixie, Fishlake, Manti-La Sal, and Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forests)
- Utah Reclamation Mitigation Conservation Commission

6.2.1.2 Tribal Governments¹

- Moapa Band of Paiutes
- Ute Indian Tribe (Uintah and Ouray Reservation)

6.2.1.3 State Agencies

The BLM and Western also are coordinating with the following state agencies:

- State of Colorado
 - Colorado Department of Agriculture
 - Colorado Department of Natural Resources
 - Colorado Parks and Wildlife
 - Colorado State Land Board
- State of Nevada
 - Nevada Department of Agriculture
 - Nevada Department of Wildlife
 - Nevada Division of State Lands
- State of Utah
 - Utah Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office
 - Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration
 - Utah Department of Agriculture
 - Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

¹ This list includes only those tribes that have signed a Cooperating Agency MOU. The BLM and Western also are conducting formal government-to-government consultation with all federally recognized Native American Tribes residing in, or with cultural ties to, the analysis area to inform the Tribes of the proposed undertaking and solicit concern/comments regarding possible traditional religious and cultural importance (see Section 6.2.3.1).

- State of Wyoming
 - Wyoming County Commissioners Association
 - Wyoming Department of Agriculture
 - Wyoming Game and Fish Department

6.2.2 Local Agencies

The BLM and Western are in contact with the following counties:

- Wyoming: Carbon, Sweetwater
- Colorado: Garfield, Mesa, Moffat, Rio Blanco
- Utah: Beaver, Carbon, Daggett, Duchesne, Emery, Grand, Iron, Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, Uintah, Utah, Wasatch, Washington
- Nevada: Clark, Lincoln

The BLM and Western also are coordinating with Little Snake River Conservation District, Medicine Bow Conservation District, Douglas Creek Conservation District, Saratoga-Encampment-Rawlins Conservation District, Sweetwater County Conservation District, White River Conservation District, N-4 State Grazing Board, and University of Wyoming.

6.2.3 Government-to-Government and Section 106 Consultation

It is the responsibility of all federal agencies to comply with the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA and the ACHP's regulations when planning and carrying out their undertakings. In doing so, they are required to consult with Native American Tribes, SHPOs, local government entities, and other interested parties, depending on the specifics of the undertaking. Such consultation with Native American Tribes is central to the Section 106 process. Guidance documents for Tribal Government-to-Government consultation include, but are not limited to, EO 13175, Secretarial Order 3206, and USDOJ Policy on Consultation with Indian Tribes. As the lead for Government-to-Government and Section 106 consultations, the BLM sent letters to tribes and consulting parties, offering consultation opportunities regarding this project. BLM managers as well as line officers from other federal agencies such as Western and USFS participated in multiple meetings with tribes.

6.2.3.1 Government-to-Government Consultation

Tribal consultation for the proposed Project began when a certified letter was mailed on July 20, 2010, to the following federally recognized Native American Tribes either residing in or with cultural ties to the analysis area:

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation | • Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah |
| • Northern Arapaho Tribe of the Wind River Reservation | • Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians of Utah |
| • Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation | • Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation |
| • Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation | • Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation of Idaho |
| • Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation* | • Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation |
| • Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation | • Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada |

- Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation
- Las Vegas Tribe of Paiute Indians of the Las Vegas Indian Colony
- Lovelock Paiute Tribe of the Lovelock Indian Colony
- Moapa Band of Paiute Indians of the Moapa River Indian Reservation
- Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fallon Reservation and Colony
- Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation
- Reno-Sparks Indian Colony*
- Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation
- Summit Lake Paiute Tribe of Nevada
- Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada
- Walker River Paiute Tribe of the Walker River Reservation
- Washoe Tribe of Nevada & California
- Winnemucca Indian Colony of Nevada
- Yerington Paiute Tribe of the Yerington Colony & Campbell Ranch
- Yomba Shoshone Tribe of the Yomba Reservation
- Fort Mojave Indian Tribe
- Hopi Tribe of Arizona
- Kaibab Paiute Tribe
- Navajo Nation
- San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
- Jicarilla Apache Tribe
- 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 San Felipe
- Pueblo of San Juan
- Pueblo of Santa Ana
- Pueblo of Santo Domingo
- Pueblo of Tesuque
- Pueblo of Zuni
- Chemehuevi Indian Tribe

The letter initiated formal government-to-government consultation, informed the Tribes of the proposed undertaking and solicited their concern/comments regarding possible historical and/or traditional ties to the area or information related to the presence of properties of traditional religious and cultural importance. Included in the letters were a Project map, response form, and return address stamped envelope. The response form and return address envelope were enclosed with the letters as a means to inform the BLM and Western if any of the Tribes wished to participate in the consultation efforts or had any concerns associated with the proposed Project.

Seven of the Native American Tribes responded to the initial consultation letter dated July 20, 2010 (Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation, Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada, Las Vegas Paiute Tribe, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Pueblo of Laguna, and Pueblo of Santo Domingo). A tribal member of the Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada requested copies of the Project maps, which were provided via email. The Las Vegas Paiute Tribe and Pueblo of Santo Domingo indicated on the response form that they do not require consultation at this time; however, they may request other opportunities to consult with the BLM and Western in the future. In their response, the Pueblo of Laguna indicated that the proposed Project would not have a significant impact but requested an opportunity to review any newly discovered archaeological sites and that photographs be taken of the sites. Face-to-face meetings with the BLM

and Western were requested by the remaining three Tribes (Goshute, Duckwater Shoshone, and Paiute Tribe of Utah).

BLM and Western met with the Paiute Tribe of Utah on December 1, 2010, and the Duckwater Shoshone as well as the Ely Shoshone on January 12, 2011. In January of 2011, the Utah BLM contacted the Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation in response to their request for a meeting. During their discussion, the Goshute tribe determined that the proposed Project was “not very close to their tribe,” and therefore, no meeting would be necessary. The Pueblo of Laguna, Pueblo of Santo Domingo, and Las Vegas Paiute returned a response indicating that the information provided in the letter notification was sufficient and no further consultation was necessary. The Ely Shoshone sent a response requesting more information about the proposed Project; the BLM contacted the tribe in August 2010 to discuss the proposed Project. Representatives from the Ely Shoshone attended the meeting on January 12, 2011, with BLM and Western. At this meeting, the Duckwater Shoshone requested large Project maps of the areas where the proposed Project could affect tribal lands. These maps were provided to the Duckwater Shoshone through the Ely, Nevada, BLM FO.

In early 2011, follow-up phone calls were made to all the tribes to update tribal contact information. New information was updated to the Project’s tribal contact list in preparation for a second letter to be mailed in the fall of 2011. The second letter requested more focused information regarding tribal concerns and sites and provided additional information about the consultation process, development of the PA, and findings from the file search conducted in the winter of 2010/2011.

In late September 2011, a second set of letters was sent to the Native American Tribes listed in **Table 3.11-1** inviting them to participate in development of the Draft PA. The letters included details of the proposed Project, a description of historic properties identified through the file search, and information on a subsequent upcoming meeting on October 18, 2011, in Salt Lake City, Utah, to discuss the PA process. Only the Hopi Tribe responded to the second letter. The Hopi were interested in ongoing consultation on the proposed Project and requested copies of the cultural resources inventory report and any proposed treatment plans for review and comment. In addition, the Hopi requested an ethnographic overview of the proposed Project area.

On April 19, 2012, the BLM and Western held an online conference call to discuss the status of the draft PA. The USFS attended the call. The consulting parties listed in Section 3.11.1.1 and the Native American Tribes listed in **Table 3.11-1** were invited to participate in the conference call. None of the invited Native American Tribes participated in the call.

At the request of the Ute Tribal Council, the BLM and Western attended a Ute Tribal Council Meeting on May 31, 2012, and met with the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Southern Ute Tribe, and Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation to discuss the proposed Project. The BLM and Western gave a presentation of the proposed Project and answered questions from the Tribes. In general, the questions focused on Project components, tribal consultation, BIA responsibilities, and ROWs on tribal lands. The Ute Mountain Ute were concerned about Project impacts to human remains, cultural landscapes, TCPs, and sacred sites.

Western and the BLM attended another Ute Tribal Council meeting on August 28, 2012. During the meeting, detailed Project maps of the refined transmission line corridors, a Project description, and the schedule for completion of the Draft EIS were presented to the Council members. As requested by the Council, Western and the BLM also met with the Ute Tribe’s Energy and Minerals Department. Project information, a Project map, and contact information were left with the Council members and the Energy and Minerals Department. At this time, no other meetings have been held with the Ute Tribal Council.

On November 8, 2012, the BLM and Western held an online conference call to discuss the status of the draft PA. The consulting parties listed in Section 3.11.1.1 and the Native American Tribes listed in **Table 3.11-1** and Section 6.3.3 were invited to participate in the conference call. None of the invited Native American Tribes participated on the call.

On November 26, 2012, the BLM and Western sent letters to five additional pueblos as part of the consultation process. The five pueblos included the Pueblo of San Ildefonso, Pueblo of Santa Clara, Pueblo of Sandia, Pueblo of Taos, and Pueblo of Zia. Included in the letters were a Project map, response form, and return address stamped envelope. The letters provided information on the proposed Project, APE, PA process, and historic properties identified as a result of the file search. Of the five Pueblos contacted, only the Pueblo of Santa Clara responded to the letter. In his response, the Governor of the Santa Clara Pueblo stated that the Pueblo does not require consultation at this time. None of the other contacted pueblos responded to the letters.

On April 19, 2013, the BLM and Western held another online conference call to discuss the status of the PA. The consulting parties and the Native American Tribes listed in **Table 3.11-1** and Section 6.3.3 were invited to participate in the conference call. None of the invited Native American Tribes participated on the call.

On May 23, 2013, the BLM and Western sent letters to the Northern Arapaho Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Eastern Shoshone of the Wind River Reservation, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Moapa Band of Paiute Indians of the Moapa River Indian Reservation, and the Energy and Mineral Department of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation requesting a meeting with each of the Tribes. Updated Project maps were enclosed with the letters. Attached to the Moapa Band of Paiute Indians' letter was a copy of the fully executed MOU between the BLM and Moapa signed by the Tribal Chairman and BLM Wyoming State Director (January 13, 2012). The MOU establishes the Moapa as a cooperating agency in the environmental impact analysis and documentation process. Attached to the letter to the Ute Indian Tribe was a draft MOU between the Ute Indian Tribe and BLM for the Tribe's review and consideration. The Tribe was asked to sign the MOU and return it to the BLM if it was acceptable. On December 23, 2013, the BLM received a signed copy of the MOU from the Ute Tribe. No responses were received from the other Tribes.

On July 8, 2013, the BLM sent a letter and a copy of the Draft PA to the consulting parties and the Native American Tribes in **Table 3.11-1** and Section 6.3.3. The consulting parties and Tribes were requested to review the Draft PA, and to use the enclosed comment form to document their comments and return the form to the BLM. The consulting parties and Tribes also were informed of a series of face-to-face meetings to be held at the BLM Rawlins FO in Wyoming (July 25, 2013), BLM Craig FO in Colorado (July 26, 2013), BLM Price FO in Utah (July 30, 2013), BLM Cedar City FO in Utah (July 31, 2013), BLM St. George FO in Utah (August 1, 2013), and BLM Southern Nevada FO in Nevada (August 2, 2013). The purpose of the meetings was to review and discuss the Draft PA. None of the invited Tribes attended the meetings.

On July 16, 2013, the BLM received a letter from the Hopi Tribe in the response to the BLM letter sent on July 8, 2013. Per the letter, the Hopi Tribe deferred comments on the Draft PA to the SHPOs and other interested Tribes. However, the Tribe expressed interest in consulting on any proposal that has the potential to adversely affect Ancestral Puebloan or Fremont prehistoric sites that may be located in the area of the proposed Project, and the Tribe "looks forward" to receiving copies of the overview and cultural resources inventory reports for review and comment.

The BLM received a letter dated September 4, 2013, from the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony THPO. Per the letter, the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony elected to not participate in the proposed Project. The THPO expressed her concern with the use of the term "government-to-government consultation" in reference to the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony when no consultation with the Tribe had occurred. As

such, the THPO requested that the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony be removed from the list of “consulted” Tribes in the Draft PA and EIS.

On November 4, 2013, the BLM and Western sent a letter to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation initiating government-to-government consultation with the new administration of the Ute Indian Tribe and requesting a meeting with the Business Committee to discuss the proposed Project. Enclosed with the letter were updated Project maps.

On January 7, 2014, representatives from the BLM (including the Utah State Director), Western (project manager and tribal coordinator), USFS (Forest Supervisor), BIA, and TransWest met with the Ute Business Committee to provide an update on the proposed Project; to discuss the Alternative II-F (which would cross approximately 3 miles of Tribal trust lands) versus the Applicant Proposed Alternative; and to answer questions or address any concerns the Tribe had regarding the proposed Project. Copies of the Project PowerPoint presentation and Project maps were provided to the Committee members. In addition, the BLM presented the signed MOA between the BLM and Ute Indian Tribe to the Ute Business Council Chairman for their tribal records. The Ute Business Committee’s discussions focused on the importance of the status of the Ute Tribe as a sovereign nation, the importance of economic development to the Tribe, the effects of the proposed Project on property values of private and tribal lands, and solutions that would benefit both the Tribe and the Project. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman of the Committee stated that the Committee would decide whether or not the Tribe supports the ROW across tribal lands. If they agreed to support the ROW, the Committee would provide a contact person to the BLM and would be open to negotiations, including a meeting with the Project proponent.

On April 8, 2014, representatives from the BLM (including the Acting Las Vegas FO Manager, the project manager, cultural resources lead, national transmission support team archaeologist, district archaeologist, and Native American coordinator); Western (the project manager and tribal coordinator); and the USFS (cultural resources lead) met with the Moapa Band of Paiute Indians of the Moapa River Indian Reservation’s Tribal Council and the Tribe’s cultural contact and briefed them on the proposed Project. The Council Chair was given a copy of the Draft PA to forward to the cultural contact, per request). As of this date, no specific properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to the contacted Native American Tribes have been identified within or near the analysis area through the government-to-government consultation efforts. In general, concerns expressed by the Tribes have been with human remains, TCPs, cultural landscapes, and sacred sites; however, the Tribes have yet to identify any specific sites or properties of tribal importance (including TCPs and sacred sites). Opportunities for the identification of locations of possible traditional religious and cultural importance that may be affected by the proposed Project, as well as opportunities for the Tribes to express their concerns, would remain open throughout the consultation process, which currently is ongoing and would continue through Project construction.

On May 22, 2014, the BLM’s Cedar City FO Manager, national transmission support team archaeologist, district archaeologist, and project manager; Western’s project manager and tribal coordinator); and the USFS’s cultural resources lead and project manager for major transmission projects met with the Paiute Tribe of Utah Tribal Council to provide a project update and discuss resources of concern to the Tribal Council. In general, the questions from the Tribal Council focused on location of the Agency Preferred Alternative, whether affected tribes have given permission to cross tribal lands, and how the Agency Preferred Alternative might change if they do not receive ROW permits from affected tribes. The Tribal Council also expressed the need for tribal monitors and ongoing coordination with the Tribe. The BLM distributed copies of the draft PA and invited them to upcoming meetings to discuss the PA content. The Tribal Council indicated they would be interested in meeting to discuss the PA.

A second set of PA meetings were held in Salt Lake City, Utah on June 17-18, 2014. Invitations were sent to all interested parties with opportunities for in-person and teleconference participation. One

federally recognized Native American Tribe, the Pueblo of Santa Anna, participated by teleconference. The Uinta Band of Utah Shoshone Indians (a non-federally recognized tribe) attended the meeting.

On August 4, 2014, representative from the BLM (the BLM Utah State Director and Deputy State Director of Lands and Minerals, the Vernal FO Manager and Assistant Field Manager, the cultural resources lead and national transmission support team archaeologist and the BLM project managers for the TransWest and Energy Gateway South projects); Western (the project manager), the USFS (the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Supervisor and project manager for major transmission projects) along with representatives from TransWest Express and Rocky Mountain Power met with Ute Business Committee of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation to provide updates on the TWE and EGS Projects and discuss the TWE BLM/USFS-preferred and Western-preferred alternatives. The Ute Business Committee indicated they would meet with the proponents through the tribal attorney to negotiate project ROWs.

Consultation with the tribes and pueblos will continue throughout the Project as stipulated under EO 13175, November 6, 2000.

6.2.3.2 Section 106 Consultation

The ACHP is authorized by Section 211 of the NHPA to issue regulations to govern the implementation of Section 106 of the NHPA. These regulations, “Protection of Historic Properties” (36 CFR Part 800), establish the process that federal agencies must follow in order to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and provide the ACHP its required opportunity to comment. Section 106 establishes a four-step review process by which historic properties are given consideration during the conduct of federal undertakings.

The four steps are as follows:

1. Initiate the Section 106 process by establishing the undertaking, defining the APE, and consulting with the appropriate parties, including federal agencies, SHPOs, ACHP, Native American Tribes, local governments, interested parties, and the public;
2. Identify historic properties through inventory and evaluation;
3. Determine effects to historic properties using the criteria of adverse effects found in 36 CFR 800.5; and
4. If adverse effects occur, take appropriate measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate those effects.

Regulations in 36 CFR 800 outline the process through which historic preservation legislation under the NHPA is administered. Regulations in 36 CFR 800.14 allow federal agencies to adopt program alternatives to 36 CFR 800 and to tailor the Section 106 process to better fit agency procedures or a specific project. The most common program alternative is a PA, which is negotiated between the federal agency, SHPO, and ACHP (if they choose to participate). A PA for a complex project lays out the steps the agency, SHPO, Native American Tribes, and other consulting parties agree to take to consider and resolve any adverse effects an undertaking might have on historic properties.

A PA among BLM, Western, USFS, ACHP, Bureau of Reclamation, BIA, NPS, USFWS, TransWest, and the Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada SHPOs was developed as allowed in 36 CFR 800.14 b(1) (ii) when effects on historic properties cannot be fully determined prior to approval of the undertaking. The PA outlines general and specific measures the federal agencies will take to fulfill their objectives and responsibilities regarding the protection of historic properties under the NHPA. Western and the BLM will consult with Native American Tribes and other consulting parties on the PA.

As part of the PA process, the BLM and Western sent letters to local governments, organizations, agencies, interested parties, and Native American Tribes in September 2011 inviting them to be consulting parties to the agreement. In addition, these groups were invited to participate in an all-day meeting on October 18, 2011, in Salt Lake City, Utah, to discuss the Project, Section 106, NEPA, and development of the draft PA. These groups included the following:

- Oregon-California Trail Association (OCTA)
- Alliance for Historic Wyoming
- The Old Spanish Trail Association
- Moffat County
- Mesa County
- Utah Governor's Public Lands Policy Coordination Office (PLPCO)
- Church History Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
- Milford Archaeological Research Institute
- Mountain Meadows Association
- Mountain Meadows Massacre Descendants
- Mountain Meadows Monument Foundation
- National Trust for Historic Preservation
- Utah Rock Art Research Association
- Utah Professional Archaeological Council
- Huntington Eccles Scenic Byway
- Utah Statewide Archaeology Society (USAS)
- Archaeo-Nevada Society
- Nevada Rock Art Foundation
- Nevada Archaeological Association (NAA)
- Lincoln County Chapter of the NAA
- Clark County Cultural Site Stewardship Program
- National Park Service
- State of Utah Trust Lands Administration (SITLA)

See Section 6.2.3.1 for a list of the Native American Tribes who were invited to the October 18, 2011, meeting.

Representatives of the OCTA, USAS, Latter Day Saints Church, PLPCO, and Mountain Meadows Massacre Descendants were able to attend the meeting on October 18, 2011, in Salt Lake City. Two additional groups (NPS and Alliance for Historic Wyoming) participated in the meeting via conference call.

Additional meetings were held in Salt Lake City, Utah on June 17-18, 2014. Invitations were sent to all interested parties with opportunities for in-person and teleconference participation. The following signatories were in attendance: BLM; Western; USFS; ACHP; NPS; TransWest; and the Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada SHPOs. Participating consulting parties were as follows: OCTA, SITLA, PLPCO, Uinta Band of Utah Shoshone Indians, Church History Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Old Spanish Trail Association, Nevada Archeology Association, Pueblo of Santa Anna, Tracks Across Wyoming, Alliance for Historic Wyoming, Mountain Meadows Massacre Descendants (unaffiliated)

Consulting parties are defined by the NHPA regulations as “certain individuals and organizations with a demonstrated interest in the undertaking [who] may participate as consulting parties due to the nature of their legal or economic relation to the undertaking or affected properties, or their concern with the undertaking’s effect on historic properties” (36 CFR 800.2[c][5]). The regulations emphasize that the “views of the public are essential to informed Federal decision-making in the Section 106 process” (36 CFR 800.2[d][1]). Each of the consulting parties has been afforded an opportunity to participate in development of the PA and may be invited to participate as a concurring party. A concurring party concurs with the terms of the PA and may participate in implementing the stipulations of the PA or may benefit from the PA. It should be noted that consulting and concurring parties do not have authority to execute, amend, or terminate the PA; that authority is confined to the signatories

(36 CFR 800.6[c][1]). For the Project, the signatories include BLM, Western, ACHP, USFS, Bureau of Reclamation, NPS, BIA, USFWS, TransWest, and the Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada SHPOs.

In addition to the organizations, local governments, interested parties, and agencies listed above, the BLM and Western have made a reasonable and good faith effort to identify and seek government-to-government consultation with federally recognized Native American Tribes with religious and cultural ties to the analysis area that “attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by an undertaking (see Section 6.2.3.1) Each of the Native American Tribes has been afforded an opportunity to participate in development of the PA and may be invited to participate as a concurring party.

6.2.4 Biological Coordination and Consultation

6.2.4.1 General Biological Coordination

Interagency coordination among the BLM, Western, and cooperating agencies including the USFS and USFWS, has been on-going throughout the development of the EIS via meetings, conference calls, letters, and e-mail correspondence. In August 2009, the BLM established the Biological Resources Task Group (BRTG) composed of biologists from the BLM, Western, USFS, USFWS, BIA, Reclamation, URMCC, and the Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada state wildlife agencies. The 2009 BRTG calls were discussions for both the Energy Gateway South and TransWest Express Transmission projects. Starting in January, 2010, the BRTG calls were held separately for the two projects. The TWE BRTG meets via conference call once a month to discuss the status of the proposed Project, issues, and approach to addressing key biological resource issues

6.2.4.2 ESA Section 7 Consultation

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 USFWS 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 proposed Project began with the submittal of written correspondence to the USFWS from the BLM in July 2009. A biological resources coordination meeting was held at the BLM Wyoming State Office on January 19, 2010, with participation by the BLM, USFWS, and AECOM. The purpose of the meeting was to define the coordination and communication process for developing lists of special status species including federally listed species. On August 25, 2010, the USFWS responded with a list of threatened and endangered species and species proposed or candidates for listing with potential to occur within the TWE action area.

In early 2011, the USFWS, BLM, USFS, BIA, and USACE, federal agencies with the authority and responsibility to perform certain actions associated with the proposed 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 non-listed 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.

On January 21, 2014, the BLM, Western, USFS, and AECOM met with USFWS representatives to discuss the TWE Section 7 consultation. Prior to that meeting, AECOM provided the USFWS with a

draft BA outline and a screening matrix and updated list of species proposed to be carried forward in the BA. On February 21, 2014, the USFWS sent a letter to the lead agencies confirming the list of species to be addressed in the BA, providing general and species-specific recommendations for those species and detailed comments on the BA outline.

Pursuant to Section 7(c)(1) of the ESA, the BLM and Western, in conjunction with the appropriate cooperating agencies, has prepared a Biological Assessment (see **Appendix N**) to initiate formal consultation with the USFWS and fulfill agency obligations under Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA for the Agency Preferred Alternative route. The BLM and Western will work collaboratively with the USFWS to ensure that the USFWS 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 any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources by the Applicant.

6.2.4.3 Greater Sage-grouse Habitat Impact Analysis and Compensatory Mitigation

Additional biological coordination efforts regarding the analysis of Project-related impacts to and compensatory mitigation for sage-grouse habitat have taken place periodically since 2011. These efforts have involved TransWest, BLM, Western, USFS, USFWS, and state wildlife agency biologists. Meetings in 2011 and early 2012 focused on the draft and final Framework for Greater Sage-Grouse Impacts Analysis for the TransWest Express Transmission Project developed by the BLM and USFWS. Subsequent meetings focused on TransWest's efforts to develop a HEA model to inform the level of compensatory mitigation that would be needed to offset Project-related impacts to sage-grouse habitat. In April 2013, a smaller technical advisory group, comprised of agency sage-grouse experts, was convened to review the Agency Preferred Alternative, discuss HEA model parameters, and define the schedule for completing the HEA model. Following completion of the Final EIS, it is anticipated that the technical advisory group will continue meeting, as needed, to review and approve the final output of the HEA model and identify suitable compensatory mitigation actions for impacts to sage-grouse habitat.

6.2.4.4 Desert Tortoise

Interagency coordination regarding desert tortoise conservation among the BLM, Western, USFWS, and other stakeholders has been on-going throughout the development of the EIS via meetings, conference calls, letters, and e-mail correspondence. In 2012 and 2013, multiple meetings and conference calls focused on addressing the need to collect data required to inform the Section 7 consultation process and allow the USFWS to determine the level of incidental take anticipated during construction and operation of the project. Field surveys were conducted in the fall of 2013 on the Agency Preferred Alternative corridors in Nevada and southern Utah using the Probabilistic Sampling protocol approved by the USFWS for large-scale linear projects located within desert tortoise habitat. Results of the field surveys were compiled and submitted to the USFWS in 2014 (AECOM 2014) and have been incorporated into the project Biological Assessment. The BLM and Western also have developed a diverse set of required mitigation measures and a Raven Management Plan to avoid and reduce potential adverse impacts to the desert tortoise. These measures are discussed in Section 3.8.6.

6.2.4.5 Migratory Birds

Interagency coordination regarding migratory bird conservation among the BLM, Western, USFS, USFWS, state wildlife agencies and other stakeholders has been on-going throughout the development of the EIS via meetings, conference calls, letters, and e-mail correspondence. The BLM, Western, and USFS have entered into a MOUs with USFWS as directed under Executive Order 13186 in order to promote inter-agency conservation efforts. In 2012 and 2013, multiple interagency meetings and conference calls focused on addressing potential impacts to migratory bird populations and developing appropriate conservation measures through the EIS process. Complete analysis of potential impacts to migratory bird species covered under the MBTA in addition to further analysis of species identified as species of conservation priority by USFWS is located in Section 3.22. TransWest

has committed to implementing design features during construction and operation of the Project that ensure consistency with APLIC recommendations (APLIC 2012, 2006). TransWest also has committed to ensuring a no net loss of sagebrush habitats through the implementation of compensatory mitigation determined by the Habitat Equivalency Analysis, as discussed in Section 3.8.6.3. The BLM, Western and USFS anticipate determining mitigation approaches to address potential impacts to migratory bird habitat not covered under the HEA process in collaboration with the USFWS, state wildlife agencies, and local stakeholders during the final site specific design process.

6.3 EIS Distribution List

In an effort to reduce printing costs, individuals on the mailing list received postcard notifications directing them to download the EIS from the Project website at <http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/hdd/transwest.html>. In addition, the document is available on CD and as a limited number of hardcopy versions, available at the locations listed below.

- BLM Wyoming State Office, Cheyenne, Wyoming
- BLM Rawlins FO, Rawlins, Wyoming
- BLM Colorado State Office, Lakewood, Colorado
- BLM Little Snake FO, Craig, Colorado
- BLM White River FO, Meeker, Colorado
- BLM Grand Junction FO, Grand Junction, Colorado
- BLM Utah State Office, Salt Lake City, Utah
- BLM Cedar City FO, Cedar City, Utah
- BLM Fillmore FO, Fillmore, Utah
- BLM Moab FO, Moab, Utah
- BLM Price FO, Price, Utah
- BLM Richfield FO, Richfield, Utah
- BLM St. George FO, St. George, Utah
- BLM Vernal FO, Vernal, Utah
- BLM Nevada State Office, Reno, Nevada
- BLM Caliente FO, Caliente, Nevada
- BLM Las Vegas FO, Las Vegas, Nevada
- USFS Dixie National Forest, Cedar City, Utah

A list of federal, state, and local agencies and representatives, Indian tribes, organizations, media, libraries, and individuals is being maintained throughout the NEPA process. The initial Project mailing list was developed by the BLM Wyoming State Office and has been supplemented as individuals express interest in the proposed Project. Individuals are provided with the opportunity to be added to the mailing list either through the Project website, registration at public meetings, or by contacting the BLM Wyoming State Office. A complete distribution list is available in the administrative record.

6.3.1 Federal Agencies and Representatives

6.3.1.1 Department of Interior Agencies

- Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Bureau of Reclamation
- Fish and Wildlife Service
- Geological Survey (USGS)
- Mineral Management Service
- National Interagency Fire Center
- National Park Service

6.3.1.2 Department of Energy Agencies

- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- Western Area Power Administration

6.3.1.3 Other Federal Agencies

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Army Corp of Engineers
- Department of Agriculture (USDA)
- Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
- Farm Service Agency
- Forest Service
- Natural Resources Conservation Service
- Department of Defense (DOD)
- Army
- Navy
- Air Force
- Department of Energy (DOE)
- Department of Transportation (DOT)
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
- Federal Highway Administration
- Environmental Protection Agency

6.3.1.4 Congressional Delegations

There are 21 federal legislators (U.S. Senate and House of Representatives) on the Project mailing list.

6.3.2 State and Local Agencies and Representatives

- 25 Colorado state divisions and departments
- 37 Utah state divisions and departments
- 12 Nevada state divisions and departments
- 20 Wyoming state divisions and departments
- 35 Conservation districts and regional water districts
- 77 state legislators (Senators and Congressmen, Governors and Lieutenant Governors)
- 41 counties
- 111 cities and municipalities

6.3.3 Indian Tribes

- Eastern Shoshone of the Wind River Reservation
- Winnemucca Indian Colony of Nevada
- Northern Arapaho Tribe of the Wind River Reservation
- Yerington Paiute Tribe of the Yerington Colony & Campbell Ranch
- Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation
- Yomba-Shoshone Tribe of the Yomba Reservation
- Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation
- Fort Mojave Indian Tribe
- Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation
- Hopi Tribe of Arizona
- Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation
- Kaibab Paiute Tribe
- Paiute Tribe of Utah
- Navajo Nation
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians of Utah
- San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
- Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation
- Jicarilla Apache Tribe
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation of Idaho
- Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation
- Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada
- Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation
- Las Vegas Tribe of Paiute Indians of the Las Vegas Indian Colony
- Lovelock Paiute Tribe of the Lovelock Indian Colony
- Moapa Band of Paiute Indians of the Moapa River Indian Reservation
- Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fallon Reservation and Colony

- Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation
- Reno-Sparks Indian Colony
- Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation
- Summit Lake Paiute Tribe of Nevada
- Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada
- Walker River Paiute Tribe of the Walker River Reservation
- Washoe Tribe of Nevada & California
- 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 San Felipe
- Pueblo of San Ildefonso
- Pueblo of San Juan
- Pueblo of Sandia
- Pueblo of Santa Ana
- Pueblo of Santa Clara
- Pueblo of Santo Domingo
- Pueblo of Taos
- Pueblo of Tesuque
- Pueblo of Zia
- Pueblo of Zuni
- Chemehuevi Indian Tribe

6.3.4 Organizations and Individuals

There are over 325 special interest groups and organizations on the Project mailing list. Organizations, individuals, and companies that have added their names to the mailing list during the Project receive notifications and other relevant Project mailings.

6.4 Preparers and Reviewers

As required by NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1502.17), **Tables 6-3** and **6-4** list the people responsible for disseminating and preparing this Draft EIS. The BLM and Western have retained AECOM as a third-party consultant to assist with the preparation of this EIS (**Table 6-5**). AECOM was selected by the lead agencies to avoid any conflict of interest. AECOM has certified that it does not have any financial or other interest in the decisions to be made pursuant to this EIS.

6.4.1 Bureau of Land Management

Table 6-3 Bureau of Land Management EIS Team

Team Member	Responsibility/Resource
BLM Wyoming State Office	
Sharon Knowlton	Project Manager
Dennis Saville	Wildlife Program Lead
Ranel Capron	Archaeology Lead
Sherry Lahti-Roche	Visuals Lead
Brent Breithaupt	Paleontology
Bob Means	Forestry
Beverly Gorny	External Affairs Lead
BLM National Transmission Support Team	
Signa Larralde	Cultural Resources
Christine Pontarolo	Biological Resources
Mark Wimmer	NEPA
BLM Rawlins FO	
Heather Schultz	POC-RECO Project Manager
BLM Rock Springs FO	
Carol Montgomery	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Colorado State Office	
Jennifer Whyte	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Grand Junction FO	
Bridget Clayton	POC-Asst. Field Mgr
BLM Little Snake FO	
Louise McMinn	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM White River FO	
James Roberts	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Colorado River Valley FO	
Monte Senor	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Utah State Office	
Shauna Derbyshire	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Cedar City FO	
Brandon Johnson	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Fillmore FO	
Clara Stevens	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Moab FO	
Jan Denney	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Price FO	
Connie Leschin	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Richfield FO	
Michael Utley	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Salt Lake FO	
Dave Watson	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM St. George FO	
Teresa Burke	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Vernal FO	
Cindy Bowen	POC-Realty Specialist

Table 6-3 Bureau of Land Management EIS Team

Team Member	Responsibility/Resource
BLM Nevada State Office	
Fredrick Marcell	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Ely District	
Dan Netcher	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Southern Nevada District Office	
Philip Rhinehart	POC-Realty Specialist

6.4.2 Western Area Power Administration**Table 6-4 Western Area Power Administration EIS Team**

Team Member	Responsibility/Resources
Steve Blazek	Project Manager
Matt Blevins	Environmental Team Lead
Claire Douthit	NEPA Attorney
John Bremer	Lead Attorney
Ree Rodgers	Archaeology
Stephen Tromly	Archaeology
Misty Kae Sporer	Biology
Carey Ashton	Realty
Jay Braileigh	Biology
Steve Webber	Realty

6.4.3 USFS**Table 6-5 USFS EIS Team**

Team Member	Responsibility/Resources
Kenton Call	IDT Leader/Project Lead
Adam Shaw	NEPA Specialist
Joe DiBenedetto	Paleontology
Lucretia Smith	GIS, Range
Chad Hermandorfer	Water Resources
Rick Dustin	Visual, Recreation & Lands Special Uses
Kevin Draper	Visual
Marian "Omar" Jacklin	Archeology
David Olsen	Wildlife
Chris Mease	Fisheries
Terry Miller	Vegetation
Stacey Weems	Soils
Charley Rosier	Recreation & Lands Special Uses
Mike Scottorn	Timber
Andrew Orlemann	Timber
Tim Metzger	Fire

6.4.4 AECOM

Table 6-6 AECOM EIS Team (Third-party Consultant) List

AECOM Team Member	Responsibility/Resource	Degree/Certification	Experience (years)
Mark Raming	Project Director	M.L.A. Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning B.A. Zoology and Ecology	37
Matt Petersen	Project Manager, Cumulative Impact Analysis	M.S. Aquatic Ecology B.S. Fisheries	18
Melanie Martin, <i>ICF Jones & Stokes</i>	Assistant Project Manager, Land Use Plan Amendments Lead, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	M.S. Environmental Policy and Natural Resource Management Certificate, Advanced Study in Natural Resource Management B.S. Agriculture	16
David Fetter	Assistant Project Manager, Water Resources	B.S. Watershed Science	10
Julie Barraza	Wildlife Biology, Migratory Birds	B.S. Wildlife Biology	5
Bill Berg	Geology, Paleontology, Minerals	M.S. Geology B.S. Geology	24
Sue Coughenour	Document Production	General Education Studies	29
Rollin Daggett	Aquatic Species, Special Status Aquatic Species	M.S. Freshwater and Marine Biology B.S. Zoology	36
Lindsey DeBell	Air Quality	M.S. Geochemical Systems B.S. Creative Studies Biology	13
Chris Dunne	Land Use	B.S. Natural Resources Management	15
Ron Dutton, <i>Sammons & Dutton, LLC</i>	Socioeconomics	M.S. Economics with specializations in Regional Economics and Public Utility Economics B.S. Economics	25
Anne Ferguson	Recreation	M.S. Environmental Sustainability B.S. Natural Resource Recreation LEED Accredited Professional	10
Amy Gilboy	Vegetation, Special Status Plants	M.S. Resource Ecology and Management, Concentration: Terrestrial B.S. Biological Science	16
Steve Graber	Public Health and Safety	B.S. Natural Resources Management B.A. Economics	8
Janet Guinn	Public Involvement, Consultation and Coordination, Land Use, Special Designations, Recreation, Wild Horses, Cultural Resources	B.S. Psychology/Anthropology	10
Michael Heugh	Transportation	M.E. Transportation Engineering B.S. Mathematical Sciences	6
Ruth Idler	Document Production, Visual Resources Support	General Education Studies	25
Brian Kennedy	Transportation	B.A. Special Major, Environmental Planning and Design	29
Spencer Martin	Biological Task Lead	M.E.M. Resource Ecology/Conservation Biology B.A. Biology	24

Table 6-6 AECOM EIS Team (Third-party Consultant) List

AECOM Team Member	Responsibility/Resource	Degree/Certification	Experience (years)
Terra Mascarenas	Soils	B.S. Soil and Crop Science, Concentration in Environmental Science Certificate of Technology	15
Sue Milcan	Data Processing and Database Management Support	B.S. Range Ecology/Land Reclamation	25
Kim Munson, RPA	Cultural Resources	M.A. Anthropology B.A. Anthropolgy	16
Andrew Newman, <i>ICF Jones & Stokes</i>	Wildlife Biology Lead	M.S. Natural Resource Management B.S. Conservation Biology	10
Merlyn Paulson	Visual Resources	M.L.A. Landscape Architecture B.L.A. Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning	36
Brent Read, <i>ICF Jones & Stokes</i>	GIS	M.S. Watershed Science B.S. Forestry, Concentration in Forest Fire Science	11
Erik Schmude	Wildlife Biologist	B.S. Wildlife Fisheries Science B.A. American Studies	10
Brian Taylor	GIS	B.A. Geography, Emphasis in GIS	5
Jason Thoene, <i>ICF Jones & Stokes</i>	GIS Lead	M.S. Geographic Information Systems B.A. Geology	12