



CHAPTER 6

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
6. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION	6-1
6.1 Public Scoping and Review.....	6-1
6.1.1 EIS Scoping Process.....	6-1
6.1.2 Disturbed Site Nomination Scoping.....	6-3
6.1.3 Public Review of the Draft EIS.....	6-3
6.2 Government-to-Government Consultation.....	6-9
6.3 Coordination with BLM Washington Office and Arizona Field Offices	6-12
6.4 Agency Cooperation, Consultation, and Coordination	6-12
6.5 Stakeholder Outreach and Coordination	6-14
6.6 Potential Adoption of the EIS by Other Organizations.....	6-15

TABLES

	Page
6-1 RDEP Scoping Meetings	6-2
6-2 Draft EIS Public Meetings.....	6-3
6-3 Commenters by Affiliation	6-4
6-4 Commenters by Geographic Area ¹	6-4
6-5 Public Comment Summary	6-5
6-6 Number of Individual Comments per Planning Issue Category	6-6
6-7 Comments related to Purpose and Need and the Alternatives.....	6-7
6-8 Number of Individual Comments related to Impact Analysis.....	6-8
6-9 GIS Related Comments.....	6-8
6-10 Nominated Sites Comments.....	6-8
6-11 Comments on REDA in Comparison to Comments on the SEZ.....	6-9

CHAPTER 6

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

6.1 PUBLIC SCOPING AND REVIEW

The BLM Arizona sponsored a public scoping period to support preparation of the RDEP EIS. During the scoping period, BLM solicited comments on the development of the RDEP, including its overall scope and issues and concerns regarding solar energy development in Arizona, and to nominate previously disturbed sites to be considered for renewable energy development.

6.1.1 EIS Scoping Process

The formal public scoping process for the EIS began on January 13, 2010, when the BLM Arizona State Office published the Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* on January 13, 2010. The RDEP EIS scoping period ran from January 13, 2010, to March 11, 2010. The Notice of Intent notified the public of the BLM's intent to prepare an EIS, provided information on the proposed action, announced the dates for the public scoping period, and included a list of BLM-identified preliminary issues.

The preliminary issues identified in the Notice of Intent included:

- Suitability of the site or area for renewable energy generation and scale of possible generation;
- Proximity of the site or area to the existing electrical transmission grid and the feasibility of integrating new electric generation projects with the grid;
- Proximity of the site or area to population and electric use (load) centers;
- Determining the appropriate renewable energy generation technologies for implementation site-by-site or area-by-area;

- The possible need for environmental remediation of RDEP sites or areas based on previous uses and levels of disturbance and possible contamination of the sites or areas; and
- Addressing the possible need for remediation, and incorporating remediation into design criteria that that might apply to site- or area-specific projects.

In addition to the Notice of Intent, the BLM notified the public of the RDEP and associated scoping period through media outlets, postcards, emails, and the RDEP Web site.

The BLM hosted 10 scoping meetings between February 8, 2010, and February 25, 2010. The scoping meetings gave the public an opportunity to learn and ask questions about the RDEP, to submit their site proposals, and to share issues and concerns with the BLM. The BLM chose an open-house meeting format to encourage broader participation, to allow attendees to learn about the RDEP at their own pace, and to enable attendees to ask BLM representatives questions in an informal one-on-one setting. In addition, the BLM provided a 25-minute presentation at each meeting about the RDEP and the public's role in the scoping process. **Table 6-1**, RDEP Scoping Meetings, lists the scoping meeting dates, locations, and the number of people who attended each meeting.

Table 6-1
RDEP Scoping Meetings

Date	Location	Number of Attendees
Monday, February 8, 2010	Phoenix, Arizona, BLM Arizona State Office	39
Tuesday, February 9, 2010	Tucson, Arizona, The Hotel Arizona	41
Wednesday, February 10, 2010	Sierra Vista, Arizona, Buena High School	4
Thursday, February 11, 2010	Phoenix, Arizona, Arizona Game and Fish Department	7
Wednesday, February 17, 2010	Fredonia, Arizona, Fredonia High School	2
Monday, February 22, 2010	Snowflake, Arizona, Pioneer Junior College	9
Tuesday, February 23, 2010	Flagstaff, Arizona, Coconino High School	8
Wednesday, February 24, 2010	Kingman, Arizona, La Senita Elementary School	26
Thursday, February 25, 2010	Yuma, Arizona BLM Arizona Yuma Field Office	8

Comments received during the initial scoping period largely fell into several key categories: environmental, socioeconomic, siting and technology, stakeholder involvement, cumulative impact analyses, impact mitigation, policy, land use planning, alternatives to be analyzed, and coordination with ongoing regional and state planning efforts (see list in **Section 1.10**, Key Planning Issues). The scoping summary report and copies of all written comments submitted by mail,

email, or in person at public meetings are available from the BLM Arizona State Office and on the RDEP Web site; transcripts from the public meetings are also available.

6.1.2 Disturbed Site Nomination Scoping

To facilitate the site nomination process, the BLM launched a Web site that provided RDEP details, a list of nominated sites, and a site submittal form (see RDEP Web site for complete scoping report, forms, and scoping materials at http://www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/energy/arra_solar/scoping.html). Before the BLM Arizona State Office published the project Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register*, local, state, and federal agencies, private companies, and members of the public nominated 42 potential sites. Throughout the scoping period, the BLM continued to receive nominations for consideration through the Web site, individual letters, and scoping meetings from local governments, businesses, and members of the public, resulting in 22 additional nominated sites for a total of 64 sites to date. **Appendix C**, Solar and Wind Energy Assessment of Nominated Sites, summarizes all nominated sites. The appendix is an analysis and evaluation of the sites. The appendix provides background information for the nominated sites, including solar and wind energy potential, environmental characteristics, and potential remediation or restoration requirements. During public review of the Draft EIS five sites were requested to be withdrawn from consideration by the land administrators (State of Arizona and BLM Arizona Strip Field Office).

6.1.3 Public Review of the Draft EIS

BLM published the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the RDEP Draft EIS for public review and comment in the *Federal Register* on February 17, 2012. The BLM distributed the Draft EIS to individuals, agencies, and organizations on the RDEP mailing list and to all cooperating agencies and tribes for a 90-day public comment period. Five public meetings were held in early March and April to provide an opportunity to comment on the RDEP EIS (**Table 6-2**, Draft EIS Public Meetings). During the five meetings, 121 people registered their attendance. These public meetings were structured in an open house format with BLM specialists available to provide information on the Draft EIS in general, the alternatives, analysis, specific resources of concern, or on the planning process.

Table 6-2
Draft EIS Public Meetings

Date	Location	Number of Attendees
Tuesday, March 20, 2012	Phoenix, Arizona, Sheraton Crescent Hotel	30
Wednesday, March 21, 2012	Flagstaff, High Country Conference Center	20
Thursday, March 22, 2012	Kingman, Hampton Inn	18
Tuesday, April 10, 2012	Yuma, Yuma Civic and Convention Center	30
Wednesday, April 11, 2012	Tucson, Holiday Inn	23

At the public meetings and on the RDEP website, the public was also provided information on how to submit comments on the Draft EIS. The BLM received written submissions from approximately 3,398 individuals by mail, e-mail, and submitted orally and in writing at the public meetings. Of the total individuals who sent letters, approximately 3,327 of them were associated with form letters, and approximately 71 were considered to be associated with unique submissions. Most written submissions included more than one comment, so the 71 unique submissions yielded 362 discrete comments. **Table 6-3**, Commenters by Affiliation, and **Table 6-4**, Commenters by Geographic Area, provide a summary of the types of commenters and where they reside.

Table 6-3
Commenters by Affiliation

Affiliation	Number of Commenters	Percentage of Total Commenters
Government	17	27%
<i>Federal</i>	6	9%
<i>State</i>	6	9%
<i>Local</i>	5	8%
Elected Officials	0	0%
Educational Institutions	0	0%
Commercial Sector/Businesses	4	6%
Organizations/Non-profits	6	9%
Individuals ¹	34	53%
Tribal Government	3	5%
Total	64²	100%

¹ Does not include form letter submissions, but does include form letters that had unique, substantive comments.

² This number is lower than the 71 total submissions as the total count included five meeting transcripts and two agencies that had submissions from more than one department. When multiple agency departments submitted comments (e.g., AZ DEQ Water Division and Air Division), the agency was counted as one commenter (e.g., AZ DEQ).

Table 6-4
Commenters by Geographic Area¹

Location	Number of Commenters	Percentage of Total Commenters
Within Arizona	42	66%
Outside of the Planning Area (CA, OR, DC, UT)	12	18%
Unknown	10	16%
Total	64	100%

¹ Calculations do not include form letters.

Comments covered a wide spectrum of thoughts, opinions, ideas, and concerns. BLM recognizes that commenters invested considerable time and effort to submit comments on the Draft EIS, and developed comment analysis methodology to ensure that all comments were considered as directed by NEPA regulations (the methodology is described in **Appendix G**, Response to Comments on the Draft EIS). **Table 6-5**, Public Comment Summary, and **Table 6-6**, Number of Individual Comments per Planning Issue Category, provide a summary of the key issues received in comments on the Draft EIS.

Table 6-5
Public Comment Summary

Issue	Description
REDA screening	New criteria were suggested that should be used to eliminate additional areas/resources from REDA consideration, criteria that should be modified to broaden or narrow REDAs, or criteria that should be taken off the list for screening purposes.
Design features and BMPs	Revisions to several design features, required studies and plans, and BMPs were requested.
Development incentives	Commenters suggested additional development incentives they would like BLM to consider as part of the Final EIS.
Alternatives	New information, corrections, or changes were presented on existing alternatives.
Nominated sites	Suggestions were made for specific nominated sites to be removed from consideration. Comments were also directed at the site ranking analysis and REDA screening of nominated sites. Additional site-specific information was provided to aid in the REDA screening process.
Impact analysis	Suggestions on how to improve impact analysis or new information for analysis was provided for multiple resources.
Agua Caliente SEZ	Comments focused on either requesting elimination of the SEZ, modifying existing boundaries, or suggested new areas that should be considered.
Solar PEIS and RDEP	Commenters suggested that the RDEP Final EIS should include the new information from the Solar PEIS Supplement.

Table 6-6
Number of Individual Comments per Planning Issue Category

Issue Category	Number of Individual Comments	Percent of Total Comments
Purpose & Need	13	4%
<i>Tribal lands</i>	6	2%
<i>Private lands</i>	2	<1%
<i>Solar PEIS</i>	3	1%
<i>Site specific requirements</i>	2	<1%
Land Tenure Alternative	2	<1%
Load Center Alternative	2	<1%
Transmission Alternative	10	3%
Water Alternative	5	1%
New Alternative	1	<1%
SEZ	35	10%
Nominated Sites	29	8%
Elimination Criteria	56	15%
Exclusion Areas	1	<1%
Development Incentives	12	3%
BMPs and Design Features	25	7%
Disposal sites	1	<1%
Policy in Alternatives	4	1%
Required Plans and Studies	7	2%
Mitigation Measures	11	3%
Impact Assumptions	1	<1%
Cumulative Impacts	3	1%
RFDS	10	3%
Air Quality	4	1%
Climate Change	3	1%
Cultural Resources	19	5%
Lands & Realty	1	<1%
Grazing	1	<1%
Noise	1	<1%
OHV	1	<1%
Socioeconomics	1	<1%
Soils	1	<1%
Transmission	7	2%
Tribal Interests	7	2%
Vegetation	2	<1%
Water	2	<1%
Wildlife	24	7%
Edits	27	7%
Extension Requests	5	1%
GIS	11	3%
Implementation Actions	4	1%
Other plans and planning efforts	2	<1%
Planning issues	11	3%
<i>Evaluation of data/decisions</i>	7	2%
Total	362	100%

Based on the initial issue categories, further review of the comments revealed a majority of comments were related to the stated purpose and need and elements of the alternatives (56% of the total comments), followed by a much lower percentage of comments on the impact analysis (17% of the total comments), elements of the proposed Agua Caliente SEZ (10%), nominated sites (8%), and GIS analysis (3%). **Table 6-7**, Comments related to Purpose and Need and the Alternatives, through **Table 6-11**, Comments on REDA in Comparison to Comments on the SEZ, provide a summary of the specific issues received in each category.

Table 6-7
Comments related to Purpose and Need and the Alternatives

Issue Category	Number of Individual Comments
Purpose & Need	13
<i>Tribal lands</i>	6
<i>Private lands</i>	2
<i>Solar PEIS</i>	3
<i>Future NEPA requirements for siting within REDA</i>	2
Land Tenure Alternative	2
Load Center Alternative	2
Transmission Alternative	10
Water Alternative	5
New Alternative	1
SEZ	35
Nominated Sites	29
Elimination Criteria	56
Exclusion Areas	1
Development Incentives	12
BMPs and Design Features	25
Disposal sites	1
Policy in Alternatives	4
Required Plans and Studies	7
Percentage of Total Comments	56%

**Table 6-8
Number of Individual Comments related to Impact
Analysis**

Issue Category	Number of Individual Comments
Mitigation Measures	23
Impact Assumptions	1
Cumulative Impacts	3
Air Quality	4
Climate Change	3
Cultural Resources	6
Grazing	1
Noise	1
OHV	1
Socioeconomics	1
Transmission	7
Tribal Interests	1
Vegetation	2
Wildlife	9
Percentage of Total Comments	17%

**Table 6-9
GIS Related Comments**

Issue Category	Number of Individual Comments
Data Availability	10
Requests for independent verification	1
Data Corrections	1
Percentage of Total Comments	3%

**Table 6-10
Nominated Sites Comments**

Issue Category	Number of Individual Comments
Agricultural lands in nominated sites	1
Cultural resources that occur in nominated sites	3
New nominated sites	1
Sites near National Park Service units	2
Site ranking method	3
Using the REDA screening criteria on the nominated sites	3
Request to re-evaluate the nominated sites	15
General nominated site comments	1
Percentage of Total Comments	8%

Table 6-11
Comments on REDA in Comparison to Comments on
the SEZ

Issue Category	Number of Individual Comments
REDA Comments	
Purpose & Need	13
<i>Tribal lands</i>	6
<i>Private lands</i>	2
<i>Solar PEIS</i>	3
<i>Site specific requirements</i>	2
Land Tenure Alternative	2
Load Center Alternative	2
Transmission Alternative	10
Water Alternative	5
Nominated Sites	29
Elimination Criteria	56
BMPs and Design Features	25
Disposal sites	1
GIS	11
Percentage REDA Comments	42%
SEZ Comments	
Access through the SEZ	2
REDA criteria should be applied to the SEZ	6
County planning coordination	3
Cultural resources in the SEZ	4
Modify the SEZ boundary	5
Recreation within the SEZ	1
SEZ selection criteria	3
Water resources	2
Wilderness characteristics	1
Wildlife within the SEZ	7
Percentage SEZ Comments	10%

Comments on the Draft EIS that presented significant new data or addressed the adequacy of the document, the alternatives, or the analysis are responded to in **Appendix G**, Response to Comments on the Draft EIS. Changes were made to several portions of the Draft EIS as a result of comments and reflect consideration given to public comments.

6.2 GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION

The federal government works on a government-to-government basis with Native American tribes. The government-to-government relationship was formally recognized on November 6, 2000, with Executive Order 13175 (*Federal Register*, Volume 65, page 67249). As a matter of practice, the BLM coordinates with all tribal governments, associated native communities, native organizations, and tribal individuals whose interests might be directly and substantially affected

by activities on public lands. In addition, Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consult with Indian tribes for undertakings on tribal lands and for historic properties of significance to the tribes that may be affected by an undertaking (36 CFR 800.2(c)(2)). BLM Manual 8120 (BLM 2004a) and BLM Handbook H-8120-1 (BLM 2004b) provide guidance for Native American consultations. The BLM has given substantial consideration to the proper conduct of government-to-government consultations for this project in order to provide for multiple opportunities for tribal consultation and has provided tribes with multiple ongoing opportunities to comment and receive information on and participate in the RDEP.

Executive Order 13175 stipulates that tribes identified as “directly and substantially affected” be consulted by federal agencies during the NEPA process. The BLM initiated contact with the following 23 tribal governments early in the EIS process:

- Ak-Chin Indian Community
- Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe
- Pascua Yaqui Tribe
- Colorado River Indian Tribes
- Cocopah Indian Tribe
- Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
- Hualapai Tribe
- Hopi Tribe
- White Mountain Apache Tribe
- Havasupai Tribe
- San Carlos Apache Tribe
- Tonto Apache Tribe
- Navajo Nation
- Yavapai-Apache Nation
- Chemehuevi Tribe
- Kaibab Paiute Tribe
- Fort Mojave Tribe
- Pueblo of Zuni
- Gila River Indian Community
- Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
- Tohono O’odham Nation

- Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
- San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe

Before and during the EIS public scoping phase, the BLM presented information on the RDEP to tribal officials and representatives in meetings at tribal offices at the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, Gila River Indian Community, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Ak-Chin Indian Community, Kaibab Paiute Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, and Hopi Tribe.

In May and June 2010, the BLM sent formal letters to the tribes inviting them to serve as cooperating agencies for the EIS and initiating formal consultation in accordance with the NHPA and other legal authorities. Although no tribes requested formal status as cooperating agencies, several tribal governments responded with comments or requests for additional information or meetings.

In March 2011, letters were sent to the tribes providing an update on the progress of the EIS effort and the preliminary alternatives. BLM responded to letters and email correspondence received from several interested tribes. On April 15, 2011, the BLM Arizona State Director presented information and discussed the RDEP with elected tribal leaders at a meeting of the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona in Phoenix. Handouts were distributed to provide information on the project with preliminary maps of alternatives.

In August 2011, BLM sent letters to nine tribal governments to inform them that the newly proposed Agua Caliente SEZ would be analyzed in this EIS. Associated consultations are ongoing.

In addition to presentations at the Inter Tribal Council and follow-up contacts with tribal governments and staff via letters, email, and telephone, BLM managers and staff participated in face-to-face meetings with officials or representatives of the Gila River Indian Community, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Ak-Chin Indian Community, Tohono O'odham Nation, Hopi Tribe, Kaibab Paiute Tribe, Pueblo of Zuni, Hualapai Tribe, Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, Cocopah Tribe, San Carlos Apache Tribe, and White Mountain Apache Tribe.

During these meetings, the tribes identified their interests and concerns in regard to developing renewable energy projects on tribal lands, and highlighted a need by some tribal officials to better understand the nature, benefits, costs, and environmental impacts of various technologies. Tribes are concerned about the potential adverse effects of renewable energy development on tribal lands, adjacent lands, traditional territories, archaeological sites, and places of traditional cultural and religious importance. They are also concerned about potential impacts on springs and other water sources, and on animal and plant species of cultural significance. Some tribal representatives expressed concern about the visual impacts of solar tower and wind technologies.

On March 8, 2012 the BLM sent letters to tribal leaders and staff, requesting comments on the Draft EIS, offering meetings, and pointing out EIS sections of particular interest. On April 17, 2012, the BLM presented information on RDEP at a meeting of the Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group in Sells, Arizona. The Four Southern Tribes include the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Gila River Indian Community, Ak-Chin Indian Community, and Tohono O'odham Nation. On May 23, 2012, the State Director, District Managers, and Field Managers met with tribal representatives about ongoing projects; the meeting focused on RDEP and renewable energy projects. Officials, staff, and members of the Colorado River Indian Tribes, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Kaibab Paiute Tribe, Gila River Indian Community, and Ak-Chin Indian Community attended this meeting (to which all Arizona tribes were invited) hosted at the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation.

The BLM will continue to consult with interested tribes and will continue to keep all tribal entities informed about the NEPA process for the EIS. In addition, the BLM will continue to implement government-to-government consultation on a case-by-case basis for site-specific renewable energy development projects on BLM-administered lands.

6.3 COORDINATION WITH BLM WASHINGTON OFFICE AND ARIZONA FIELD OFFICES

Regular conference calls and other communications have been held with the BLM Washington Office, Division of Renewable Energy (the lead BLM office for preparing the Solar PEIS) to share information and coordinate developments between the two initiatives. The BLM Arizona State Office and the field offices provided much of the GIS data that allowed mapping of the BLM-administered lands and special areas. Arizona state and field office staff were involved in reviews of preliminary internal draft sections of text.

Coordination with the state and field office staff will continue throughout the preparation of the Final EIS and ROD to ensure that the analysis adequately reflects state- and local-level concerns and issues regarding renewable energy development.

6.4 AGENCY COOPERATION, CONSULTATION, AND COORDINATION

The BLM invited federal, state, and local government agencies to participate in preparation of the RDEP as cooperating agencies. To date, eight agencies are working with the BLM as cooperating agencies, including:

- Arizona Corporation Commission
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
- Arizona Department of Water Resources
- Arizona Game and Fish Department
- Arizona State Land Department

- Bureau of Reclamation
- Central Arizona Water Conservation District
- Mohave County
- National Park Service
- Western Area Power Administration

Interactions with the cooperating agencies have included periodic briefings and reviews of preliminary, internal draft sections of text. The BLM will continue to engage these cooperating agencies throughout the preparation of the EIS.

Additional agencies the BLM Arizona has coordinated with include the following:

- Department of the Interior:
 - Bureau of Indian Affairs
 - US Fish and Wildlife Service
 - National Park Service
 - Arizona BLM RAC
- Department of Defense:
 - Military installations in Arizona
- US Forest Service
- State agencies:
 - Governor's Office
 - Arizona State University
 - Arizona Geological Survey
- Counties and municipalities

In accordance with the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA, the BLM is coordinating with and soliciting input from the Arizona SHPO. The BLM and Arizona SHPO are following the coordination protocols in the Arizona Protocol relating to amending resource management plans; the protocol provides for a phased consultation process related to historic, traditional, and cultural resources for an EIS and subsequent activities that could tier from a ROD. Per these procedures, the BLM Arizona initiated consultation with the Arizona SHPO by written correspondence on April 16, 2010. The letter introduced the RDEP and specified the need to consult on information regarding the amendment of land use plans. Also enclosed with the letter were two copies of the EIS scoping report for their review. The SHPO formally responded to the letter on May 27, 2010, expressing interest and support but no specific concerns. As the preliminary alternatives were identified, an additional letter was sent to SHPO on March 23, 2011, providing them with the new

information. The SHPO responded to the preliminary alternatives letter by requesting additional information on the preliminary alternatives. On March 8, 2012, the BLM sent SHPO a letter providing an update on the alternatives and tribal consultation, and requested their review and comments on the Draft EIS. In its consultation letter, the BLM stated that although the RDEP “would prevent or reduce adverse effects on historic properties in many areas of the State, there would still be a potential for adverse effects within some areas to which renewable energy development would be directed...Separate Section 106 consultations would take place for specific proposed projects.” On April 9, 2012, SHPO provided a letter acknowledging that their questions had been answered and that they had no additional questions at the time.

In accordance with the requirements of Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the BLM has consulted with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure that the BLM’s proposed action would not jeopardize the continued existence of any listed threatened or endangered species. These consultations are ongoing and will result in a conservation agreement and biological opinion for the RDEP.

In addition, the BLM has coordinated and consulted with the Arizona governor and governor’s office and other state agencies. Additional coordination will be conducted during review of the Draft EIS. Prior to approval of the proposed plan amendments, the governor will be given the opportunity to identify any inconsistencies between the proposed plan amendments and state or local plans and to provide recommendations in writing (during the 60-day consistency review period).

6.5 STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH AND COORDINATION

The BLM has met with numerous stakeholder groups to discuss their thoughts and ideas, and to identify any additional opportunities for or constraints on the project. The groups included:

- Arizona congressional staff
- Utilities:
 - Arizona Public Service
 - Salt River Project
 - Tucson Electric Power
- Environmental organizations:
 - Defenders of Wildlife
 - National Resources Defense Council
 - Sierra Club
 - Sonoran Institute
 - The Nature Conservancy

- The Wilderness Society
- Arizona Wilderness Coalition
- Friends of the Sonoran Desert National Monument

6.6 POTENTIAL ADOPTION OF THE EIS BY OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

The RDEP EIS provides an analysis of the beneficial and adverse environmental, social, and economic impacts associated with renewable energy development on BLM-administered lands in Arizona. It identifies land use planning decisions, management actions, project design features, and best management practices that may be implemented to avoid, mitigate, or minimize potential impacts. The information contained in the EIS and the decisions represented here may be relevant to renewable energy development on other lands, including other federal, private, state-owned, and tribal lands. They also may be relevant to decisions regarding other related activities, including development of new transmission lines, substations, and other facilities.

Other agencies may elect to adopt this EIS, or a portion of this EIS, at some time in the future. The CEQ regulations provide specific guidance on the process by which one agency can adopt another agency's final environmental document even though it did not participate as a cooperating agency (40 CFR 1506.3). According to the CEQ in its March 23, 1981, "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," Question 30:

"If the proposed action for which the EIS was prepared is substantially the same as the proposed action of the adopting agency, the EIS may be adopted as long as it is recirculated as a final EIS and the agency announces what it is doing. This would be followed by the 30-day review period and issuance of a Record of Decision by the adopting agency. If the proposed action by the adopting agency is not substantially the same as that in [46 FR 18036] the EIS (i.e., if an EIS on one action is being adapted for use in a decision on another action), the EIS would be treated as a draft and circulated for the normal public comment period and other procedures (46 FR 55, 18026-18038)."

Individual organizations should consider their own NEPA implementing regulations to evaluate the potential benefits associated with implementation of all or portions of the EIS.