

CHAPTER 5
CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 5 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION	5-1
5.1 Introduction.....	5-1
5.2 Public Involvement	5-1
5.2.1 Public Scoping Period	5-1
5.2.2 Scoping Meetings.....	5-3
5.2.3 Scoping Responses.....	5-5
5.2.3.1 Scoping Period	5-5
5.2.3.2 Comment by Issue.....	5-5
5.2.3.3 Scoping Report.....	5-5
5.2.4 Project Status/Update Newsletter.....	5-6
5.2.5 Draft EIS Distribution	5-6
5.2.6 Final EIS Distribution.....	5-6
5.2.7 Record of Decision	5-6
5.3 Criteria and Methods by which Public Input will be Evaluated.....	5-7
5.4 Agency Coordination/Consultation	5-7
5.5 Tribal Consultation and Coordination	5-8
5.6 List of Preparers and Reviewers.....	5-10
5.7 Third Party Contractor – JBR Environmental Consultants.....	5-11
5.8 Recipients of this EIS	5-13

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.2-1 Scoping Legal Notice and News Release Distribution	5-2
Table 5.2-2 Formal Scoping Meeting Dates, Times, Locations, and Attendees.....	5-4
Table 5.2-3 Number of Comments Received by Source.....	5-5
Table 5.2-4 Comments Received by Issue	5-5
Table 5.5-1 Native American Tribe/Tribal Organizations Consulted	5-9
Table 5.6-1 Interdisciplinary Team and Specialists.....	5-10
Table 5.7-1 Third Party Contractor – JBR Environmental Consultants	5-11

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 5 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQ regulations implementing NEPA require that federal agencies provide meaningful opportunities for the public and stakeholders to provide input and identify their concerns with regard to the EIS process. Federal laws, such as the ESA, the CWA, and the NHPA, mandate public involvement and consultation with agencies or federally recognized tribal governments.

This chapter documents the specific consultation and coordination efforts undertaken by the BLM throughout the entire process of developing this Draft EIS. A complete list of agencies and individuals who received the Draft EIS can be found in the Project Record.

5.2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The BLM has taken a variety of steps to inform the public; special interest groups; and local, state, and federal agencies about the Proposed Action and alternatives for this Project, and to solicit feedback from these interested parties to help share the scope and alternatives of this Project. The following sections summarize the efforts taken to consult and coordinate with all interested persons, agencies, tribes, and organizations.

5.2.1 Public Scoping Period

The public was provided a 45-day scoping period at the beginning of this Project and the EIS process to identify potential issues and concerns associated with the Proposed Action. As part of NEPA requirements, a NOI to prepare the EIS was posted for public inspection on the *Federal Register* website on April 8, 2011, and published in the *Federal Register* on April 11, 2011.

A legal notice for the Project was published in local newspapers and a news release was sent to media outlets as described in **Table 5.2-1**.

Table 5.2-1 Scoping Legal Notice and News Release Distribution

SCOPING LEGAL NOTICE AND NEWS RELEASE DISTRIBUTION
NEWSPAPER ANNOUNCEMENTS
Newspaper display announcements were placed in the Arizona Republic, state wide coverage, on April 12, 2011.
Newspaper display announcements were placed in the Arizona Republic, NW Valley zones 1 and 20 on April 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, and 23, 2011.
Newspaper display announcements were placed in the Arizona Republic, Peoria zone 2, on April 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, and 27, 2011.
Newspaper display announcements were placed in the Arizona Republic, Glendale zone 9, on April 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, and 23, 2011.
Newspaper display announcements were placed in the Arizona Republic, North Phoenix zone 21, on April 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, and 23, 2011.
Newspaper display announcements were placed in the Peoria Times on April 15 and 22, 2011.
Newspaper display advertisements were place in the Sonoran News on April 13 and 27, 2011.
Newspaper display announcements were placed in the Surprise Today on April 13, 20, and 27, 2011.
Newspaper display announcements were placed in the West Valley View on April 12, 15, 19, and 22, 2011.
Newspaper display announcements were placed in The Wickenburg Sun on April 13 and 20, 2011.
MEDIA NOTICES AND OTHER ANOUNCEMENTS
A news release was posted April 12, 2011, on the BLM website.
A news release was issued by the City of Peoria on April 19, 2011.
Email notifications were sent to agencies, government officials, special interest groups, and other interested parties on April 14 and 25 and May 24 and 26, 2011.
A project information hotline was launched on April 7, 2011, and updated on May 3 and 19, 2011.
Meeting information was posted on the BLM's website: http://www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/energy/aps-sunvalley.html on April 12, 2011.

SCOPING LEGAL NOTICE AND NEWS RELEASE DISTRIBUTION
LETTERS AND POSTCARD INVITATIONS
A total of 538 invitational letters were mailed April 12, 2011, to a mailing list comprising of government agencies, elected officials, special interest groups, individuals who commented during the ACC process, mining claimants, and other interested parties.
A postcard was mailed the week of April 12, 2011, to the same mailing list as well as 12,002 interested parties and members of the public identified based on mail carrier routes within the parameters of the Project Study Area.
NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH AND FLYERS
On April 14 and 18, 2011, staff from Galileo Project visited various community outlets, such as community centers, libraries, grocery stores, city offices, and recreational outlets in Surprise, Peoria, Circle City, Wittmann, Buckeye, and other areas along the Project route to distribute 400 flyers announcing the public meetings and to encourage attendance.
ANNOUNCING OF FORMAL PUBLIC AND AGENCY MEETINGS
Staff from Galileo Project posted 12, 18-by-24-inch signs at locations within the Project Area.
Announcement included rotating web tile with link to the BLM website, which ran April 11-30, 2011. Announcement included website announcement, which ran April 13-27, 2011. A table summarizing the locations and photographic documentation of the posted flyers and signs can be found in the Scoping Summary Report.

5.2.2 Scoping Meetings

A scoping letter was prepared and sent to a list of 538 interested individuals, agencies, and organizations. The BLM compiled the initial contact list by using contact lists from previous projects. The initial scoping mailing list is included in the Scoping Report (BLM 2011d).

Three public scoping meetings and one agency scoping meeting were held for the Project at locations around the State of Arizona, see **Table 5.2-2**.

Table 5.2-2 Formal Scoping Meeting Dates, Times, Locations, and Attendees

DATE	TIME	CITY, STATE	ADDRESS	ATTENDEES
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS				
April 26, 2011	5:30-8:00 PM	Phoenix, Arizona	Ramada Plaza Phoenix Metrocenter 12027 N 28th Dr.	29
April 27, 2011	5:30-8:00 PM	Wittmann, Arizona	Nadaburg Elementary School 21419 W Dove Valley Road	66
April 28, 2011	5:30-8:00 PM	Peoria, Arizona	Peoria Community Center 8335 W Jefferson St.	249
AGENCY SCOPING MEETINGS				
April 26, 2011	2:00-4:00 PM	Phoenix, Arizona	Ramada Plaza Phoenix Metrocenter, 12027 N 28th Dr.	23

All attendees of scoping meetings were asked to sign in and provide their contact information. Lists of individuals who signed attendance sheets at the public meetings are included in the Scoping Report (BLM 2011d). The meetings began each evening at 5:30 PM and continued until 8:00 PM. The presenting speakers at each venue were the same: Joe Incardine, BLM; Steve Cohn, BLM; and Richard Stuhan, APS. The BLM representatives discussed the meeting structure, how comments could be submitted, and provided an overview of the NEPA process. Mr. Stuhan presented a brief description and an overview of the need for the Project. BLM and APS personnel were available to answer questions from the public about the EIS analysis and Project, respectively, during an open house period both prior to and after the presentation.

Attendees at the scoping meetings were provided with handouts describing the Project as well as the NEPA process. Comment forms were also provided to all attendees to facilitate submission of written scoping comments. The public was given the option to provide comments during the meeting, using regular mail, fax, or e-mail. In addition, information regarding the Project and the NEPA process was posted on the BLM's project website and on a toll-free telephonic information line.

In addition to the public scoping, on June 8, 2011, an Economic Strategies Workshop was conducted for this Project to comply with the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook during the EIS and Land Use Plan Amendment process. The purpose of the workshop was to identify BLM management opportunities that further the social and economic goals of area communities. A complete summary of this process and the information presented at the Workshop is included in the Economic Strategies Workshop Summary (BLM 2011e), which is available online at <http://www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/energy/aps-sunvalley.html>.

5.2.3 Scoping Responses

5.2.3.1 Scoping Period

The official scoping period for the Sun Valley to Morgan Transmission Line Project occurred April 11 through May 27, 2011. However, the BLM continued to accept written comments for inclusion in the scoping process until June 2011 and has continued to accept comments for general consideration in accordance with NEPA guidelines. **Tables 5.2-3** and **5.2-4** summarize the comments that were submitted to the BLM and were included in the scoping process.

Table 5.2-3 Number of Comments Received by Source

SOURCE	COMMENTS RECEIVED
Scoping meeting submittals	86
Mailed comment form/letter	138
Electronic submittal	65
TOTAL	289

5.2.3.2 Comment by Issue

Table 5.2-4 Comments Received by Issue

ISSUE CATEGORY	COMMENTS RECEIVED
Air and Climate	1
Biology	93
Health and Safety	103
Mitigation and Alternatives	27
Need and Reliability	6
Process and RMPA	61
Recreation	11
Socioeconomic	
Property values	101
Environmental justice	1
Quality of life	5
General community	28
Scenic/Visual	103
Transportation and Traffic	52
Unclassifiable (general comments – non substantive)	343
TOTAL	935

5.2.3.3 Scoping Report

A detailed description of the scoping process, scoping comment analysis, and preliminary issues, concerns, and opportunities is contained in the Scoping Report (BLM 2011d). The Scoping Report is available online at <http://www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/energy/aps-sunvalley.html>.

5.2.4 Project Status/Update Newsletter

Newsletters that provided a project status/update were mailed to 37,085 addresses on February 27, 2012. The boundary for the delivery area included all of the APS customers and owners of undeveloped land located within the study boundary for the Project as identified through a search of the Maricopa County Tax Assessors online records. The newsletter was also sent to all parties on the BLM mailing list including 94 agency representatives, 129 government representatives, 69 special interest groups, 8 BLM special recreation permit holders, 18 tribal representatives, 14 interested parties, 214 parties who previously commented on the ACC siting process, 346 parties who submitted scoping comments, and 19 parties who intervened in the ACC siting process.

5.2.5 Draft EIS Distribution

The Draft EIS review period was initiated by publication of the NOA in the Federal Register. The Draft EIS was distributed as follows:

- A NOA was published in the Federal Register specifying dates for the comment period and the date, time, and location of the public comment meetings.
- A news release was provided by the BLM at the beginning of the comment period on the Draft EIS. The news release was submitted to the same news organizations as for the initial public scoping announcement.
- The Draft EIS was distributed to interested parties as described in **Section 5.8**.

5.2.6 Final EIS Distribution

The Final EIS distribution will be completed after consideration is given to comments received on the Draft EIS. A 30-day Final EIS availability period will be initiated by publication of a NOA for the Final EIS in the Federal Register. The Final EIS will be released as follows:

- NOA published in the Federal Register.
- Copies of the Final EIS will be sent to addresses on the updated mailing list and made available via the project website.
- A news release will be issued to the same newspapers used for previous Project announcements.

5.2.7 Record of Decision

Following the 30-day availability period for the Final EIS and the 60-day Governor's Consistency Review period that run concurrently, required because of the Draft RMPA, the BLM will prepare a ROD. The BLM ROD will be distributed to individuals and organizations identified on the updated Project mailing list and will also be available via the project website. A NOA for the ROD will be published in the Federal Register. A news release will be made to the same newspapers used for previous Project announcements.

5.3 CRITERIA AND METHODS BY WHICH PUBLIC INPUT WILL BE EVALUATED

Written comments received and oral comments from the public hearings on the Draft EIS will be reviewed and evaluated. Responses will be assessed for substantive comments and modifications or corrections will be made to the Draft EIS as determined necessary in response to these comments. Copies of all comments, along with the BLM responses, will be included in the Final EIS.

5.4 AGENCY COORDINATION/CONSULTATION

A total of 33 agencies were sent a letter inviting them to participate as a cooperating agency. They are as follows:

- Arizona Corporation Commission
- Arizona Department of Agriculture
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
- Arizona Department of Transportation
- Arizona Department of Water Resources
- Arizona Game and Fish Department
- Arizona State Land Department
- Bureau of Reclamation
- Central Arizona Water Conservation District
- City of Glendale
- City of Peoria
- City of Phoenix
- City of Surprise
- Department of Energy, Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy
- Federal Aviation Administration, Pacific Region
- Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
- Maricopa Association of Governments
- Maricopa County Air Quality Department
- Maricopa County Board of Supervisors
- Maricopa County Department of Transportation
- Maricopa County Flood Control District
- Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department
- Maricopa County Planning and Development Department
- Town of Buckeye
- Town of Wickenburg
- U.S. Air Force - Luke Air Force Base
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arizona Ecological Services
- U.S. Geological Survey
- Western Area Power Administration (Western) – Desert Southwest Region
- Yavapai County

- Yavapai County Board of Supervisors

Six agencies have accepted to participate; the following federal, state, and local agencies have signed on and been consulted as Cooperating Agencies during preparation of the EIS:

- U.S. Air Force - Luke Air Force Base
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Arizona State Land Department
- Maricopa Association of Governments
- City of Peoria
- City of Surprise

5.5 TRIBAL CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

The United States has a unique legal relationship with Indian tribal governments as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, treaties, statutes, Executive Orders, and court decisions. The BLM has a responsibility to consider and consult on potential effects to natural or cultural resources related to tribal treaty rights, traditional uses, and places of religious and cultural importance. BLM consults with tribes on a government-to-government basis pursuant to NEPA; Section 106 of NHPA; Executive Order 13175; and other laws and policies in accordance with BLM Manual 8120, *Tribal Consultation under Cultural Resources*. Although such consultations typically focus on Section 106 compliance and matters related to cultural resources, tribes are invited to comment on other issues of concern to their governments and communities.

In April 2011, the BLM contacted the following eight American Indian tribes (**Table 5.5-1**) to notify them of the Proposed Action and initiate formal consultation in preparation of the EIS: Gila River Indian Community, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Ak-Chin Indian Community, Tohono O'odham Nation, Yavapai Prescott Tribe, Yavapai Apache Nation, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, and the Hopi Tribe.

Certified letters were sent to elected tribal leaders, with copies to tribal cultural resource staff, described the proposed Project and Draft RMPA, requested comments, offered the opportunity to meet, and described plans to conduct cultural resource inventories and to share the inventory results with tribes. Aside from requests to review inventory results, at that time tribes did not identify concerns related to specific places within the Study Area. Cultural resource inventories were completed in the spring of 2012. In June 2012, BLM sent correspondence to the tribes providing an update on the EIS process and a detailed summary of the cultural resource inventory results and National Register eligibility recommendations. In July 2012, BLM presented information with an opportunity for discussion at a meeting of the Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Group consisting of representatives of the Gila River, Salt River, Ak-Chin, and Tohono O'odham tribes.

BLM described efforts to coordinate with APS and the ASLD to design the Project to avoid impacts to sensitive prehistoric sites along the Agua Fria River near the Morgan Substation. On July 30, 2012, BLM provided the tribes with copies of the survey report for their review and comment. The Yavapai Prescott Tribe provided comments on the report. The Gila River Indian Community concurred with BLM's evaluations of National Register eligibility, but

requested more information on the preferred alternative (which had not yet been identified) in order to comment on the effects of the Project. The Hopi and other tribes also requested continuing consultations.

In recognition of the special relationship with the United States government, the BLM will continue to consult with the appropriate tribal governments at an official, executive level (government-to-government) in accordance with the NHPA and other relevant legal authorities. The BLM will provide opportunities for government officials of federally recognized American Indian tribes to comment on and participate in the preparation of the EIS and will consider comments, notify consulted tribes of final decisions, and inform them of how their comments were addressed in those decisions.

Table 5.5-1 Native American Tribe/Tribal Organizations Consulted

TRIBE OR GROUP	CONCERNS EXPRESSED
Gila River Indian Community	No specific comments, but have expressed concerns about effects to prehistoric sites in the area that are regarded as ancestral.
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	No specific comments, but have expressed concerns about effects to prehistoric sites in the area that are regarded as ancestral.
Ak-Chin Indian Community	No comments; due to the Project location, defers any concerns to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Cultural Preservation Office.
Tohono O’odham Nation	Have expressed concerns about effects to prehistoric sites in the area that are regarded as ancestral. Email to BLM from the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer on April 12, 2011 expressing objection to a Draft RMPA.
Yavapai Prescott Tribe	No specific comments but have expressed concerns about effects to prehistoric sites in the area that are regarded as ancestral.
Yavapai Apache Nation	No specific comments, but have expressed concerns about effects to prehistoric sites in the area that are regarded as ancestral.
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	No specific comments, but have expressed concerns about effects to prehistoric sites in the area that are regarded as ancestral.
Hopi Tribe	Letters to BLM in April 2011 and June 2012 expressing cultural affiliation with archaeological sites and considering all ancestral sites as traditional cultural properties. Support for identification and avoidance of sites. Request for continuing consultation and copies of cultural resource inventory reports.

BLM conducts formal Section 106 consultation with the SHPO concurrently with tribal consultations. BLM sent an initial consultation letter to inform the SHPO of the proposed undertaking in April 2011. The SHPO responded, acknowledging the BLM's role as lead agency and looking forward to reviewing the draft inventory report and results of tribal consultations. In July 2012, BLM provided the SHPO with the report and consulted on National Register eligibility determinations and effect pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.4 and 36 CFR Part 800.5. SHPO concurred with the adequacy of the report and BLM's eligibility determinations.

5.6 LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS

Lead Agency: BLM, Phoenix District Office

Cooperating Agency: Hassayampa Field Office

Interdisciplinary Team and Technical Specialists: See **Table 5.6-1** below.

Table 5.6-1 Interdisciplinary Team and Specialists

RESOURCE	PHOENIX DISTRICT OFFICE
BLM National Project Manager – Joe Incardine	
District Project Manager, BLM Phoenix Field Office – Kathleen Depukat	
Hassayampa Field Office Manager – Rem Hawes	
Air Quality Climate Change Water Resources	William Wells
Cultural Resources Paleontology	Connie Stone
Geology Minerals Soils	Jeff Garrett William Wells
Land Use	Mary Skordinsky Don Applegate
NEPA Compliance	Jackie Neckels Leah Baker
Range	Mary Skordinsky Don Applegate
Realty	Jim Andersen
Recreation and Special Designations	Mary Skordinsky Don Applegate
Recreation Transportation and Traffic	Tom Bickauskas

RESOURCE	PHOENIX DISTRICT OFFICE
Public Health and Safety	Brian Achziger Dr. William Harris
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice	Henry Eichman Delilah Jaworski USFS TEAMS
Soils	William Wells
Vegetation Wildlife Including Special Status Wildlife and Migratory Birds	Kevin Grove
Visual Resources	John McCarty Don Applegate
RESOURCE	GALILEO PROJECT
Project Record Public Management	Ellen Carr Meredith Griffin

5.7 THIRD PARTY CONTRACTOR – JBR ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Table 5.7-1 Third Party Contractor – JBR Environmental Consultants

ROLE/RESOURCE	STAFF	EXPERIENCE
Project Manager Hazardous Materials and Hazardous and Solid Waste	Brian Buck, PG Salt Lake City	MS Geological Engineering BS Geology 35 Years Experience
Deputy Project Manager	Greg Brown Salt Lake City	BS Natural Resource Management 20 Years Experience
Assistant Project Manager Project Coordination, Document Control, Visual Resources	Schelle Davis Salt Lake City	BA Environmental Studies 7 Years Experience
Air Quality and Climate Change	Robert Arpino, PE Tempe Chris Johnson Boise	BS Chemical Engineering BA Communications Science 12 Years Experience BS Math and Earth Sciences (Meteorology) 28 Years Experience

ROLE/RESOURCE	STAFF	EXPERIENCE
Cultural Resources and Paleontology	Jenni Prince-Mahoney Salt Lake City	BA Anthropology MC NEPA 19 Years Experience
Cumulative Impacts	Linda Matthews Salt Lake City	BS Environmental Studies 29 Years Experience
	Jenni Prince-Mahoney Salt Lake City	BA Anthropology MC NEPA 19 Years Experience
Geology and Minerals	Jamey Sage Salt Lake City	BS Geology 14 Years Experience
	Doug Koza	BA Geology, MS Geology 34 Years Experience
Soils	Brian Boyd Reno	BS Range Resource and Wildland Soil Science 10 Years Experience
Land Use, Range, Recreation, Special Designations, Transportation and Traffic	Stephanie Lauer, CEM Missoula	MS Forestry/Watershed Management BS Geology 13 Years Experience
Public Health and Safety	Ed Handl, PE Butte	MS Chemical Engineering BS Chemical Engineering 39 Years Experience
Socioeconomics	Jan Stambro Univ. of Utah. Salt Lake City	MBA International Business BS Business Management and Finance 27 Years Experience
Environmental Justice	Jon Schulman, EIT Salt Lake City	MS Environmental Engineering MA Journalism BA English 17 Years Experience
Vegetation, Wildlife, including Special Status Wildlife and Migratory Birds	Eric Holt St. George	MS Wildlife Management BS Wildlife Resources 23 Years Experience
	Laura Arneson Salt Lake City	MS Biology BA Biology 10 Years Experience

ROLE/RESOURCE	STAFF	EXPERIENCE
Water Resources	Karla Knoop Salt Lake City	BS Watershed Sciences 26 Years Experience
GIS	Connie Pixton Salt Lake City	40 Years Experience
GIS	Nick Faust Salt Lake City	BS Geography 1 Years Experience
Administrative Support	Sue Terry Salt Lake City	Associates Secretary Sciences 26 Years Experience

5.8 RECIPIENTS OF THIS EIS

Pursuant to CEQ regulations (40 CFR § 1502.19), the BLM is circulating this Draft EIS to 1) agencies having jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved and any appropriate federal, state or local agency authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards; 2) the applicant; and 3) any agencies, organizations, or individuals requesting a copy of the document.

There were a total of 1,005 contacts on the Project mailing list. Post cards were sent to everyone on the Project mailing list to determine which contacts were interested in receiving the Draft EIS. In response to the postcard mailing, 116 contacts on the Project mailing list are receiving an electronic and/or hard copy of the Draft EIS. In addition, the Draft EIS was made available via the Project website at <http://www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/energy/aps-sunvalley.html>. Hard copies of the Draft EIS have been placed in local libraries and are available for review at the BLM's Arizona State Office, the Phoenix District Office, and the Hassayampa Field Office.

This page intentionally left blank.