

5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 HISTORY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) represents the efforts and involvement of a broad range of participants, including public agencies, tribal councils, private organizations, and individuals. The lead agency, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Kingman Field Office (KFO), met and consulted with various federal, state, county, tribal, and local agencies throughout the process. Interested parties were invited into the process through various formal and informal methods, including meetings with public agencies, tribes, interest groups, and individuals; scoping meetings; letters of invitation; e-mail correspondence; BLM website; and distribution of postcards and newsletters. This section summarizes these activities.

5.1.1 Summary of Scoping Meetings, Issues and Comments

Scoping, the first step in the EIS process, was initially conducted from November 20, 2009 through January 8, 2010. The scoping period was initiated with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register on November 20, 2009. Three public meetings and an agency meeting were held during the 45-day scoping period in Kingman, Dolan Springs, and White Hills, Arizona.

Based on additional studies, refinement of the preliminary Project description, and comments received during initial scoping, the Wind Farm Site was revised to include land managed by Reclamation while eliminating some Federal and private land previously identified as the subsequent phases of the Project. In addition, a potential opportunity to interconnect with the Moenkopi-El Dorado transmission line located about six miles south of the Wind Farm Site was identified, which if considered would require the construction of a new transmission line on public and private lands. Because these changes to the Project occurred after conclusion of the initial scoping period on January 8, 2010, and development was proposed on land administered by an additional Federal agency, a supplemental scoping period was established to allow stakeholders the opportunity to review updated Project information and identify additional comments or issues for consideration in the EIS.

The supplemental scoping period for the Project was initiated with publication of a NOI on July 26, 2010 in the Federal Register and concluded on September 9, 2010. Four public scoping meetings were held during the supplemental scoping period, with one at each of the three original scoping meetings communities and an additional meeting in Peach Springs, Arizona. BLM considered all input received after January 8, 2010, the official close of the first scoping period, through and including the comments received during the supplemental scoping period.

During initial scoping, 71 comment submissions were received and entered into a comment database. Within the 71 comment submissions, 398 issues were identified and categorized into 15 main categories of issues and 41 categories of sub-issues, allowing the Project team to identify areas of concern and quantify issues on both broad and detailed levels.

Public comments received after January 8, 2010 also were entered into this database; 20 comment submissions were received between the two scoping periods (January 8 through July 25, 2010), and 22 comment submissions were received during the formal supplemental scoping period (July 26, 2010 through September 9, 2010). Within these 42 comment submissions, 76 issues were identified. In total, 113 comment submissions were received, in which 474 issues were identified and categorized into the main categories and sub-issues.

Two broad categories of comments were identified, Actions and Alternatives, and Environmental Impacts. The Actions and Alternatives category included comments about various aspects and components of the proposed project, as well as suggestions for and concerns about alternative facilities or decisions that people felt should be considered in the EIS. Comments in this category also identified topics relative to the planning and EIS preparation process, including public review opportunities. The Environmental Impacts category included comments about the proposed project’s potential impacts on natural, human, and cultural resources, and identified the social and economic concerns that people felt should be addressed in the EIS. The comments from these two broad categories were further categorized in 15 main issue categories.

Table 5-1 summarizes the volume of comments received on each of the 15 main issue categories.

Table 5-1 Percent of Comments by Issue

Main Issue	Percent of Total Issues Identified – All Comments Received
Project Description	17.3
Project Need	3.4
Project Alternatives	5.3
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Process	7.0
Air Quality	2.7
Biological Resources	23.0
Cultural Resources	2.3
Cumulative Effects	4.2
Geology and Minerals	3.3
Hazardous Materials and Safety	1.3
Land Use, Recreation, and Transportation	8.0
Noise	4.2
Socioeconomics	9.3
Visual Resources	5.7
Water Resources	3.0
Total	100.0

A more detailed discussion of the scoping process, including a summary of public comments and issues identified in both the initial and supplemental scoping periods, is documented in the Scoping Summary Report dated March 2010 and the Supplemental Scoping Report dated November 2010. Both reports are available on the BLM website, www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/energy/wind/mohave.html.

5.1.2 Federal, Tribe, State, Local Government Agencies and Organizations Consulted

Agency and tribal coordination is an important step in a successful collaborative process for several reasons. First, early involvement with other federal and state agencies and tribal and local governments establishes a solid working relationship with each agency. It builds trust and credibility between agencies in support of the analysis in the EIS. Finally, it helps ensure that BLM decisions are supported by other agencies and conform to applicable regulatory requirements

Interested agency and interested party letters were distributed at the beginning of scoping to Tribes, agencies, and stakeholder groups to introduce the project and solicit their participation in the scoping process. Interested agency letters also included an invitation to a separate agency meeting. The following is a distribution list for the letters.

FEDERAL

U.S. Department of Agriculture

Natural Resources Conservation Service, Arizona State Office
Natural Resources Conservation Service, Kingman Field Office

U.S. Department of Defense

Air Force Region 9 Environmental Office
Luke Air Force Base
Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment)
Region IX, Navy Region Southwest Environmental Department
U.S. Air Force, Environmental Division, Chief
U.S. Air Force, Office of Deputy A/S of USAF, Environment, Safety, Occupational Health
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District Office
South Pacific Division, Los Angeles District, Arizona/Nevada Area Office

U.S. Department of Energy

Division of NEPA Affairs
National Renewable Energy Laboratory
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance (EH-23)
Western Area Power Administration

U.S. Department of Interior

Bureau of Indian Affairs
National Office
Western Area Regional Office, Environment Quality Services
Bureau of Reclamation
Deputy Commissioner
Lower Colorado Dams Office
Lower Colorado Regional Office
National Park Service
Lake Mead National Recreation Area
Air Resources Division
Grand Canyon National Park
Natural Sounds Program
NEPA/Section 106 Specialist
Natural Resources Library
Office of Environmental Policy & Compliance
Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement
Minerals Management Service, Environmental Division
Office of Surface Mining
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Division of Environmental Quality
Fish and Wildlife Service, Chief, Division of Federal Projects
Flagstaff Office
U.S. Geological Survey
Flagstaff
National Office

U.S. Department of Transportation

U.S. Federal Aviation Administration
National Headquarters Office, Obstruction Evaluation Service
Western U.S. Operations
Western-Pacific Region
U.S. Federal Communication Commission

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office of Federal Activities, EIS Filing Section
Region 9 – Environmental Review Office

Library of Congress

TRIBES

Chemehuevi Tribal Council
Colorado River Indian Tribes
Fort Mojave Tribal Council, and Aha Makav
Cultural Society
Havasupai Tribe
Hopi Tribe
Hualapai Tribe
Kaibab Paiute Tribal Council
Las Vegas Paiute Tribe
Moapa Band of Paiute Indians
Pahrump Paiute Tribe
San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
Yavapai-Apache Nation
Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe

STATE OF ARIZONA

Corporation Commission
Department of Environmental Quality
Department of Revenue
Department of Transportation
Game and Fish Department
Governor's Office
State Geological Survey
State Historic Preservation Office
State Land Department
State Parks Department

MOHAVE COUNTY

County Manager's Office
Development Services Department
Economic Development Department

LOCAL

City of Kingman
 Airport Authority
 City Manager
 Community Development
 Mayor
Boulder City
 City Manager
 Mayor
Bullhead City, Mayor
Lake Havasu City, City Manager

OTHER STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

Arizona Antelope Association
Arizona Chapter of the Wildlife Society
Arizona Desert Bighorn Sheep Society
Arizona Mule Deer Society
Arizona Riparian Council
Arizona Sportsman
Arizona Wildlife Federation
Arizona Wildlife Outfitters
Audubon Society, Arizona Chapter
Bullhead 4 Wheelers
Center for Biological Diversity
Cerbat Ridge Runners
Defenders of Wildlife
Desert Bighorn Council
Dolan Springs Chamber of Commerce
Friends of Grand Canyon
Grand Canyon Wildlands Council
Kingman Area Chamber of Commerce
Mohave Sportsman's Club
Northwest Arizona Watershed Council
Public Lands Advocacy
Sierra Club
The Grand Canyon Trust
The Nature Conservancy
The Peregrine Fund
The Sonoran Institute
Walapai 4 Wheelers
Western Resource Advocates
Western Watersheds Projects
Wild Earth Guardians

5.2 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES

BLM is required by law to prepare NEPA analysis and documentation in cooperation with any other Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law (40 CFR 1501.6). Additionally, qualified Federal agencies, or tribes, or other governments can enter into formal cooperation under this provision and are called cooperating agencies.

5.2.1 Cooperating Agencies

Cooperating agency letters of invitation were sent at the initiation of scoping to those agencies and tribal governments identified by the BLM, as having a jurisdiction over the Project or special expertise regarding resources to be analyzed in the EIS. Cooperating agencies are allowed opportunities for participation through interagency meetings and active engagement in the preparation of the EIS, in addition to other opportunities throughout the NEPA public participation process. Specific roles of the lead and cooperating agencies, as well as coordination opportunities and the issue resolution process, are defined in individual Memorandums of Understanding entered into between BLM and each cooperating agency for the Project.

In response to BLM's invitation, six entities agreed to serve in the formal role as a cooperating agency, including Reclamation, Western Area Power Administration (Western), National Park Service (NPS), Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), Mohave County, and the Hualapai Tribe. Several of the invited entities declined to serve in the capacity of a cooperating agency, but indicated an interest in being informed about the project. BLM has continued to communicate and collaborate with these agencies and tribes throughout the process through meetings, conference calls, newsletters, the BLM website, and/or other consultation.

5.2.2 Formal Consultation

5.2.2.1 Biological Resources

Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. § 661 et seq.) and Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.) prior to initiation of a project that may affect any federally listed special status species or its habitat. The Mohave County Wind Farm Project is considered a major Federal action and, in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, early coordination was initiated. The USFWS was contacted on December 16, 2010 about the potential for California condors to utilize the Project Area. On the same date, the USFWS provided information through the Peregrine Fund that California condors have been moving their use away from the Project Area for about a decade. On December 12, 2011, the USFWS also provided an evaluation of federally listed species known to occur in Mohave County and the potential to be affected by the Project. The USFWS determined in this evaluation that there were no federally listed species or critical habitat affected by the project (Section 4.5).

The BLM contacted the USFWS concerning the Project impacts on the golden eagle in accordance with the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, (16 U.S.C. 668-668c), 1940 *et seq.*, and BLM Instruction Memorandum 2010-156. Formal coordination activities have occurred, and an Eagle Conservation Plan (ECP) is being prepared as part of an Avian Conservation Strategy. Coordination dates for the ECP are included in the ECP. The potential impacts to the golden eagle are discussed in detail in Section 4.5.7.

The USFWS and AGFD were contacted initially to provide project-related information. Cooperative agreements were later established with AGFD (Memorandum of Understanding AZ-2010-05) and these agencies have participated in the project to provide their special expertise and knowledge regarding biological resource issues.

5.2.2.2 Archaeological and Historic Resources

In conjunction with preparing the EIS, BLM also is serving as the lead Federal agency in considering effects of the Project on properties listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) and implementing regulations and policies. BLM has been working with the cultural resource specialists of cooperating agencies, including Western, Reclamation, and NPS.

On March 29, 2010, BLM formally initiated consultations with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) by sending a letter providing information about the project and a copy of the cultural resources overview that had been prepared for the project. The Arizona SHPO provided comments by letter dated April 30, 2010. BLM revised the cultural resource overview and survey plan to address the SHPO's suggestions regarding the evaluation of historic roads. BLM held tours for interested agencies and tribes in March 2010 and April 2011. In January 2012, BLM provided copies of all the cultural resource reports prepared for the Project to the SHPO and tribes and consulted about determinations of National register eligibility and the effect of the project on National Register-eligible properties. The Arizona SHPO concurred with BLM's determinations of National Register eligibility and finding of adverse effect by letter dated March 1, 2012. BLM will continue to consult with the interested agencies and the Arizona SHPO throughout the EIS process and during post-EIS development of any action alternative approved by the Record of Decision. Given the possibility that an eligible prehistoric site would be disturbed by construction, it is anticipated that BLM would consult with the SHPO, federal cooperating agencies, Indian tribes, BP Wind Energy, and other consulting parties to develop and implement a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to stipulate procedures for resolving adverse effects. The MOA would stipulate that a Cultural Resource Management Plan be prepared in accordance with guidance in BLM's *Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Wind Energy*. A variety of treatment measures would be considered in preparing the plan, including recovery and preservation of archaeological artifacts and data, treating and consulting about unanticipated discoveries, conducting supplemental surveys if final designs include Project facilities outside the areas that were surveyed for cultural resources during preparation of this EIS, monitoring for vandalism or unanticipated effects, training workers to protect cultural resources during construction and operation of the Project, studies to better document ethnohistoric use of the area, conducting long-term monitoring, and developing educational materials or programs to enhance tribal and local community understanding and appreciation of the affected cultural resources. BLM is also providing a formal notification of the adverse effect determination to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, with an invitation to participate as a consulting party in the development of an MOA to resolve adverse effect.

5.2.2.3 Tribal Consultation

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 (Eos), and court decisions. The BLM has a responsibility to consider and consult on potential effects to natural resources related to tribal treaty rights or cultural use. In recognition of this relationship, BLM consults with tribal governments on a government-to-government basis pursuant to NEPA; Section 106 of NHPA; EO 13175; and other laws, EOs, 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 communities or governments.

On September 14, 2009, the BLM KFO initiated government-to-government consultation with federally recognized Indian tribes that have traditional cultural ties or interests in the area of the proposed Mohave County Wind Farm by sending certified letters to elected leaders of the following federally recognized tribes:

- Hualapai Tribe
- Fort Mojave Indian Tribe
- Colorado River Indian Tribes
- Las Vegas Paiute Tribe
- Moapa Band of Paiutes
- Havasupai Tribe
- Chemehuevi Tribe
- Hopi Tribe
- Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
- Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians
- San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
- Yavapai-Apache Nation

The letters described the proposed Project and invited the tribes to participate as formal cooperating agencies for preparation of the EIS. BLM also informed the Pahrump Paiute Tribe, which is not federally recognized, but the tribe did not respond to indicate it had an interest in the proposed project.

On November 20, 2009, BLM initiated formal Section 106 consultation by sending certified letters to elected tribal officials, with copies to the lead staff of tribal cultural resource departments. The tribes were invited to attend a coordination meeting and field tour on January 12, 2010. BLM staff followed up with contacts to tribal staff by telephone and electronic mail. In December 2009, BLM postponed the planned meeting because of a conflict with a tribal listening session that the Department of the Interior scheduled in Phoenix. In February 2010, after coordinating with tribal staff to select a new date, BLM sent letters rescheduling the meeting for March 16, 2010 and provided the tribes with copies of the Cultural Resources Class I Overview prepared for the Project and requested their review and comment. The Hualapai Tribe provided comments on the ethnographic background section of the document and shared a report relating to nearby Senator Mountain.

Representatives of the Hualapai, Las Vegas Paiute, and Yavapai Prescott tribes attended the meeting on March 16, 2010 at the KFO, followed by a tour of the proposed Project Area. The KFO Manager attended the meeting and tour. The director of the Aha Makav Cultural Society, affiliated with the Fort Mojave Tribe, planned to attend but was unable to do so. The KFO Archaeologist met with her the next day at her office to share information about the project and to offer a separate tour. The Hopi Tribe responded to the invitation indicating they would be unable to attend the meeting but wished to continue to receive copies of cultural resource reports for review and comment.

During the March 2010 field tour, Hualapai Tribe staff identified several topographic features in the Project Area and surrounding areas (some with Hualapai place names) as areas of traditional cultural concern that could be subject to visual effects from the proposed wind farm. These locations were subsequently incorporated into the visual impact analysis for the EIS and, during the spring of 2010, tribal staff participated in field visits to those places to take photographs for the visual analysis. During the spring of 2010, the Hualapai Tribe also signed a Memorandum of Understanding to serve as a cooperating agency and provide special expertise for preparation of the EIS. In addition to participating in preparation and review of the EIS, staff of the tribe's Department Cultural Resources participated in review of cultural resource reports and served as crewmembers for cultural resource surveys for the Project.

In the summer of 2010, the boundaries of the proposed project were revised to eliminate the eastern portion in the White Hills and add lands to the west that are administered by the Reclamation. On August 27, 2010, an EIS public scoping meeting for the modified project was held at the Hualapai Tribe Cultural Center in Peach Springs. Visual simulations from key observation points identified by the tribe were available at the meeting for inspection and comments. Three members of the Tribal Council attended the meeting, as did the KFO Manager.

On October 26, 2010, BLM sent letters to the tribes to update them on the revised project boundaries and to share a summary of the preliminary results of cultural resource surveys. The letters invited the tribes to participate in a field tour of the sites, and to participate in developing a Section 106 agreement document, should one be needed. The Yavapai-Prescott and Hopi tribes responded with letters acknowledging receipt of the information and requested continued involvement. On March 8, 2011, BLM sent letters inviting the tribes to attend a consultation meeting and field tour of the Project Area on April 19, 2011.

The project applicant and URS, the cultural resource consultant, provided assistance with the meeting and tour, which was attended by eight cultural committee members or staff from the Hualapai Tribe, Fort Mojave Tribe, and Colorado River Indian Tribes. The Moapa Band of Paiutes planned to attend but had to cancel on the prior day. The KFO Manager attended the tour and BLM followed up by email and distributed copies of the meeting notes to the tribes. BLM offered to arrange for a future tour for the Moapa Band of Paiutes and other tribes that did not attend the meeting but none requested another meeting or field visit at that time.

On March 21, 2011, the Hopi Tribe sent a letter expressing concern about potential impacts on bald eagles and other birds. On May 11, 2011, BLM provided reports of wildlife studies conducted for the EIS and offered to arrange for a meeting to discuss the Hopi concerns; the Hopi Tribe did not request a meeting.

On July 12, 2011, BLM distributed copies of the draft cultural resource survey report to the tribes and requested their review and comments on the report and evaluations of the eligibility of the recorded cultural resources (which include nine prehistoric sites) for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). The letter also informed the tribes of an expansion of the proposed Project boundaries that required supplemental cultural resource survey. In January 2012, BLM distributed to the tribes a report of the supplemental survey along with final reports for the seven other cultural resource studies completed for the project, and requested comments on evaluations of eligibility for the National Register and a determination of effect. The Hopi Tribe responded in February 2012, indicating that they had reviewed the cultural resource report and deferred participation in the MOA to the Hualapai Tribe, but requested continued consultation.

To date, Indian tribes have identified concerns about direct and indirect impacts to archaeological sites, visual effects to traditional cultural resources, and the cumulative effects of energy projects on traditional territories that are of cultural importance for a range of environmental and heritage values. All the prehistoric sites documented during the surveys, which the Hualapai and other tribes regard as ancestral, were determined as eligible for the National Register under Criterion D for their informational value. The Hualapai Tribe suggested that these sites might also be eligible under Criterion A; BLM will consider any information the tribes would provide identifying associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of tribal history. Tribal consultation and coordination will continue through the course of the EIS process and the development of an MOA and Cultural Resource Management Plan. Tribes also will have the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft EIS. Public meetings may be conducted at tribal communities in conjunction with the public comment period.

5.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A variety of means of disseminating information have been employed throughout the public participation process, including via publication of notices in the Federal Register, posting on the BLM website, informational newsletters, news releases, and fact sheets. Each of these is briefly described below.

5.3.1 Notice of Intent

The public was first notified of the Mohave County Wind Farm project and upcoming scoping meetings through a legal notification, and the NOI, which was published in the Federal Register on November 20, 2009. The NOI announced the intent to prepare an EIS, and advised that specific dates, locations, and times of scoping meetings would be announced through the local media and on the BLM website. In addition, the NOI provided project information including a description of proposed facilities and project location, information on how to submit comments and why they are important, and BLM contact information.

The public was notified of the second scoping process and scoping meetings through a NOI published in the Federal Register on July 26, 2010. The NOI described the proposed changes to the Project Area, advised that scoping meetings would be announced through the local media and on the BLM website, and provided information on how to submit comments.

Both NOIs were used to inform the public that the NEPA commenting process was also being used to help satisfy the public involvement process for Section 106 of the NHPA and invited Tribes to participate in the scoping process and as a cooperating agency.

5.3.2 Newspaper and Media Announcements

The public was notified of the initial scoping meetings through a press release distributed on November 23, 2009, to newspapers and local and regional news outlets.

The public was notified of the supplemental scoping meetings through a second press release distributed on August 5, 2010, to newspapers and other news outlets in the vicinity of the Project Area and regionally. Both press releases were sent to county and municipal staff, elected officials, and Arizona congressional members.

5.3.3 Additional Public Notice

The public and many agencies were notified of the initial scoping period and public scoping meetings through a newsletter distributed to approximately 1,900 people on November 25, 2009. The newsletter mailing list, which is updated during the Project, included property owners within 3 miles of the Project, local officials including municipal and county staff, Federal and State agencies, potentially interested American Indian tribes, BLM right-of-way holders, mining claimants, other permittees, and other interested parties. Information on how to contact BLM or provide scoping comments was provided in the newsletter.

In addition to the newsletter, an “interested party” letter was sent directly to elected officials, public facilities, and special interest groups (see Section 5.1.2). The letter included a description of the project, copy of the NOI, a project map, and information on how to provide scoping comments.

A second newsletter detailing the project progress was mailed to persons on the mailing list in April 2010. Newsletter 2 outlined the results of the initial scoping meetings and the progress of the data collection and alternatives identification.

The public and agencies were notified of the supplemental scoping period and public scoping meetings through a postcard distributed to nearly 2,300 parties on the expanded mailing list on August 9, 2010. The mailing list for the supplemental scoping period was expanded based on requests received through the first scoping period. The postcard noted that changes had been made to the Project since the initial scoping meetings that were held in December 2009, provided scoping meeting information, and encouraged the public to attend meetings and submit comments by September 9, 2010.

A poster announcing each of the public meetings was distributed by mail to the Dolan Springs Community Center, White Hills Community Association, and Rosie’s Den in White Hills, Arizona prior to both the initial and the supplemental scoping meetings. Also, an electronic version of each meeting announcement poster was sent by e-mail to the Kingman Chamber of Commerce with a request to share the information with its members. The purpose of the poster was to increase public awareness of the scoping meetings.

A second postcard notification was sent to the Project mailing list on August 26, 2011. This postcard provided a brief update on the Project, including changes to the Project footprint, alternatives being considered, and progress of the EIS.

A BLM website (www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/energy/wind/mohave.html) was established early in the project to provide project updates. The supplemental scoping period and scoping meeting dates were announced on the BLM website. While the BLM website is periodically updated, Project information on the website has included the NOI, public meeting information, Scoping Summary Report, Supplemental Scoping Report, project newsletters, and frequently asked questions. Additional information, including upcoming newsletters, maps, the Draft EIS, and other documents will continue to be posted to the BLM website throughout the project.

5.3.4 Public Scoping Meetings

As mentioned in Section 5.1.1, three public scoping meetings were held for the initial scoping period and four meetings were held during the supplemental public scoping period. Locations, dates and attendance of each public meeting are shown in Table 5-2.

Table 5-2 Public Scoping Meeting Attendance

Location	Initial Scoping		Supplemental Scoping	
	Date	Attendance	Date	Attendance
Dolan Springs, Arizona Dolan Springs Community Center	December 8, 2009	21	August 26, 2010	15
Kingman, Arizona Hampton Inn	December 9, 2009	37	August 24, 2010	25
White Hills, Arizona White Hills Community Center	December 10, 2009	52	August 25, 2010	28
Peach Springs, Arizona Hualapai Cultural Center	–	–	August 27, 2010	15
Total attendance at scoping meetings		110		83

The scoping meetings for both the initial and supplemental scoping periods were held in an open house format. A brief formal presentation on the proposed Project and NEPA process was made at the initial scoping meetings. Attendees were given a handout of Frequently Asked Questions and a comment form. Display boards used at the scoping meetings presented information on the Project purpose and need, Project description, planning process, purpose of the scoping process, construction process, preliminary

noise analysis results, and visual simulations. The open house format allowed attendees to browse the information on the boards and speak informally to Project team representatives.

5.4 DISTRIBUTION AND REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIS

A summary of the scoping process, data collection efforts, and the findings of the impact assessment and mitigation planning is documented in this Draft EIS. The Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIS was published in the Federal Register and advertised in local media. Public comments will be accepted for a minimum of 45 days from the date of the NOA, during which time public meetings will be held to receive comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIS.

In addition to the entities listed in Section 5.1.2, the following federal, state and local agencies, tribes, and organizations received a copy of the Draft EIS on compact disk. A list of the individuals who received a copy of the Draft EIS is available in the administrative record for the project. The Draft EIS will also be available on the project web site or by paper copy by request. The Final EIS will be sent to those who request a copy or provide comments on the Draft EIS.

FEDERAL

Natural Resources Conservation Service,
Kingman Field Office

STATE AND LOCAL

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Phoenix Main Office
Water Resources Division
Arizona Department of Transportation
Kingman District Office
Permitting Department
State Engineer's Office
Mohave County
Board of Supervisors
Development Services Department
Community Services Department
Economic Development Department
Mohave County Library District – Dolan
Springs Public Library

TRIBAL

Chemehuevi Tribal Council
Chairwoman
Cultural Resource Director
Colorado River Indian Tribes
Chairman
Museum Director
Fort Mojave Tribal Council
Chairman
Director, Aha Makav Cultural Society
Havasupai Tribe
Chairwoman
Natural Resources Department

Hopi Tribe
Chairman
Director Cultural Preservation
Hualapai Tribe
Chairman
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Kaibab Paiute Tribal Council, Chairwoman
Las Vegas Paiute Tribe
Chairperson
Cultural Resources Coordinator
Moapa Band of Paiute Indians
Chair, Cultural Committee
Environmental Committee
San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, President
Yavapai-Apache Nation
Chairman
Tribal Archaeologist
Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
President
Director, Cultural Resources

ORGANIZATIONS

Arizona Public Service
Boulevard Associates LLC
CLXNW LLC
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum
Hualapai Valley Solar LLC
Joshua Tree LLC
Maverick Helicopter Tours
Nevada Pac Mining Company
Tiger Gold Inc.
U.S. Borax Inc.
White Hills Community Association
Western States Minerals

5.5 LIST OF PREPARERS

This EIS was prepared by URS Corporation, a third-party contractor, under the direction of the BLM. Representatives from the cooperating agencies contributed and participated in the NEPA process. Table 5-3 provides the individuals who contributed to the preparation or review of the EIS and their area or areas of responsibility.

Table 5-3 List of Preparers and Reviewers

Name	EIS Responsibility	Education
Bureau of Land Management		
Don Applegate	Recreation and Visual Resources	BS, Recreation Resources Management
Eddie Arreola	Renewable Energy Coordination Office Supervisory Project Manager	BS, Engineering AS, Engineering
Mike Blanton	Rangeland Management	
William Boyett	Invasive Weeds	MS, Biology BS, Biology
Dennis Godfrey	Public Affairs	BA, Communications/History
Kevin Grove	Wildlife Resources	BS, Wildlife Conservation Biology
Sherrie Landon	Paleontology	MS, Sedimentology/Paleontology BS, Environmental Geology
Len Marceau	Outdoor Recreation and Visual	BA, Recreation
Dave Maxwell	Air Resources	MS, Air Pollution/Environmental Health MBS, Business Administration MPA, Public Administration BS, Meteorology
John McCarty	Chief Landscape Architect	BS, Landscape Architecture
Paul Misiaszek	Geology and Mining	BS, Geology
Jackie Neckels	Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Arizona Renewable Energy Coordination Office	BA, Journalism and Mass Communications AA, Commercial Art
Craig L. Nicholls	Air Resources	MS, Atmospheric Science BS, Atmospheric Science
Sally Olivieri	GIS Analysis	
John Reid	Access and Transportation	BS, Recreation and Parks Administration
Karla Rogers	Visual Resources Management	
Ruben A. Sanchez	Kingman Field Office Manager	
Connie Stone	Cultural Resources/Archaeology	PhD Anthropology MA, Anthropology BA, Anthropology
Melissa Warren	Lands and Realty	BS, Business Information Systems
Tim Watkins	Cultural Resources	
Bill Wells	Water Resources	MS, Watershed Management BS, Business Administration
Ammon Wilhelm	Wildlife Resources, Visual Analysis	
J&J Crockford Consulting		
Jerry Crockford	BLM Third-Management Consultant/Project Manager	AA, Business Management AAS, Real Estate Years of Experience: 34

Name	EIS Responsibility	Education
URS Corporation		
Peter Allen	Soils, Geology, and Geologic Hazards	BS, Civil Engineering
Tyler Besch	Transportation	BSP, Urban Planning
Lynn Bowdidge	Project Coordinator, Technical Review/QA/QC, Executive Summary	MS, Environmental Science BA, Communication
Sunny Bush	Public Health and Safety, Public Involvement Task Leader	BA, English BS, Hazardous Materials Management International Association of Public Participation Certification
J.P. Charpentier	Wildlife and Fisheries	MS, Wildlife Ecology BA, Psychology
Robert DeBaca, PhD	Wildlife, Vegetation, Wildland Fire, Invasive Species, Special Status Species, Wildlife Corridors	PhD, MS, BA, Biology BA, Environmental Conservation
Beth Defend	Project Manager	BA, Technical Journalism
Dennis Dudzik, PE	Technical Advisor	BS, Mechanical Engineering
Bob Estes	Climate and Air Quality	BS, Environmental Science
Jennifer Frownfelter	Principal-in-Charge, Land Use Compatibility	MS, Environmental Management MS, Public Policy BS, Environmental, Population, and Organismic Biology
Allison Getty	Lands/Realty, Recreation, Special Designations, Access	MA, Natural Resources
Peggy Goodrich	Climate and Air Quality	BA, Chemistry
Jeff Heyman, PE, RG	Soils, Geology, and Geologic Hazards	BS, Geology, Engineering Geology
Kirsten Johnson	Cultural Resources History	MA, Public History and U.S. History BA, History
Rich Johnson	Microwave Radar/Other Communications	BA, Management
Timothy Johnson, GISP	Project Coordination Website Comment Analysis System	MAS, Geographic Information Systems BS, Environmental Resources
David Konopka	Visual Resources	BS, Natural Resources and Landscape Architecture Grad. Studies, Landscape Architecture
David Lawrence	Visual Resources/Simulations	Coursework in Drafting Design, Music Business, and Production 3ds Max Design 2011, Certified Associate AutoCAD Civil 3D 2011, Certified Associate BLM Visual Resource Management 5-day Course
Peter Martinez	Administrative Record	MA, Geography BS, Geography
Mitch Meek	Graphics	BFA, Graphic Design
Jennifer Pyne, AICP	Water Resources	MEP, Environmental Planning BA, Politics
Meg Quarrie	Technical Editing	BA, Liberal Arts
Patty Renter	GIS Analysis	Visual Basic, 2001 Business Administration 1990
Cary Roberts	Deputy Project Manager Physical/Human Environment Task Leader	MS, Environmental Management BS, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

Name	EIS Responsibility	Education
A.E. (Gene) Rogge, PhD	Cultural Resources Task Leader Archaeology, Traditional Cultural Resources	PhD, Anthropology MA, Anthropology BA, Anthropology
Matt Spansky	Water Resources	BA, Geology
Joe Stewart, PhD	Paleontology	PhD, Systematics & Ecology MA, Systematics & Ecology BA, Biology
Mark Storm, INCE Bd. Cert.	Noise	BS, Aeronautics & Astronautics
Cardno ENTRIX – Subconsultant to URS Corporation		
Rabia Ahmed	Environmental Justice	MS, Economics BS, Economics and Statistics
Barbara Wyse	Socioeconomics	MS, Economics BA, Environmental Sciences and Policy