Application Review and Processing Meeting
Seven Counties Infrastructure Coalition
Eastern Utah Regional Connector Proposed ROW
September 11, 2019

In attendance
BLM: Lisa Wilkolak, Liz Cresto, Katherina Diemer, and Nicollee Gaddis-Wyatt, Roger (by phone)
Civco Engineering: Troy Ostler, Bret Reynolds
Monument Engineering: Diego Carroll
Power Engineers: Amanda O'Connor

Agenda and Notes

1. Introductions
    - Mike McKee was scheduled to attend the meeting, but got called to Washington D.C.
    - Discussion of the need to have the Coalition submit a letter authorizing the BLM to speak with the represented contractors.
2. Agenda Overview and Modifications
3. Project Overview/BLM Questions
    - Reps provided a brief overview of the history of discussion of a road through the Book Cliffs.
        - Newspaper articles as early as the 1930s
        - Application submitted and EIS process started in early 1990s, but the ROW application was ultimately withdrawn.
        - The Vernal Field Office already authorized the portion of the road in its FO that the proposed road would connect to. The road was constructed in late 2000s
        - UDOT feasibility study
        - Economic benefit study
4. Status of Application
    - Reviewed the BLM's request for additional information and the response.
        - Request #1 road alignment – BLM is satisfied with the Coalition's response. No follow up needed.
        - Request #2 Short Term ROWS – The BLM is satisfied with the Coalition's response as long as the 300 foot short term ROW encompasses all staging needed. If any additional staging is needed outside of the 300 feet, it must be included in the application now or applied for at a later date if not known now. No follow up needed unless changes to plan.
        - Request #3 purpose and need. BLM confirmed all that was required was the confirmation that what was submitted in the application is the official plan. Discussed differences between what was in the application and what was discussed at a county council meeting. No follow up needed.
        - Request #4 Valid existing rights. Due to the large number of valid existing rights, the BLM asked the Coalition for more information than was provided in the

response. Discussion of method for determining what is on the ground now, public land data is public record. Used East Canyon Road (Grand County B road) as an example. Grand County has a valid existing right for the road. How will the Coalition address that? Also discussed the pipeline that runs parallel to East Canyon Road. Would the Coalition pay to move the pipeline? As the request is now, the road impacts the pipeline. Approximate cost of $1 million per mile to relocate a pipeline. **Follow up needed, application not considered a complete application until this is discussed and addressed in depth.** Results may change the alignment of the road proposal.

- Request #5 financial ability. The Coalition is currently working with the governor's staff to get a letter verifying that the State of Utah/UDOT anticipates taking over the road and continued maintenance. **Follow up needed.**
- Request #6 formation documents. The BLM asked for documents related to the formation of the Coalition. Coalition provided Certificate of Establishment and Pass Through Funds Agreement. No follow up needed.

5. NEPA Requirements
    - Coalition asked about process for determining EA or EIS. Discussed timeline for EIS – 2 years since it is a road project.
    - The portion of the road in the Vernal Field Office was authorized under an EA
6. Cost Recovery
    - Per the CFR, the Coalition would be cost exempt on this project
    - Two options: enter into a cost recovery agreement or application is added to the end of the list. Discussed the possible cost recovery agreement, $330,000 is an estimated starting amount for the project, assuming NEPA is contracted out.
7. IDT Review/Checklist
    - BLM needs a complete application package before the proposal is brought before the IDT
8. NEPA Resource Front Loading
    - Reps asked about conducting surveys now in anticipation of what the specialists may recommend after the checklist is complete. Conducting surveys now is at the Coalition's own risk since the resources have not been analyzed yet. The BLM could come back after the checklist is complete and require something totally different than what the Coalition did.
    - Discussion about following proper procedure for any field surveys that are conducted.
9. Stakeholder Outreach
    - Coalition has spoken with SITLA about the project
    - Coalition has not spoken with the one private property owner yet
10. Other