

# Section 5.0 Agencies and Individuals Consulted and List of Preparers

## 5.1 Agencies, organizations and individuals.

BLM consulted with 13 other Federal agencies or bureaus, 24 Tribal entities, 6 state agencies, and 20 county agencies. The mailing list containing all agency points-of-contact is contained in the Administrative Record for this project. Ten groups provided BLM with comments on the LUP Amendment (Appendix A).

## 5.2 List of Preparers

### 5.2.1 Dynamac Corporation

Jim Melton, *Project Manager*  
M.S., Resource Development, Texas A&M University  
B.S., Soils Science, Texas A&M University

Ronald E. Lamb, *Public Involvement, Socio-Economics*  
M.S., Environmental Science, Johns Hopkins University  
M.A., Political Science/International Economics, University of Nebraska  
B.A., Political Science (Economics minor), University of Nebraska

Sarah DeRosear, *Wildlife Biology, T&E and Sensitive Species*  
M.S., Wildlife Management, University of Maine  
B.A., Biology, Earlham College

Anthony Horne, *Cultural Resources*  
B.A., Anthropology, University of Texas at Austin

Steve Yarbrough, *Biology, T&E and Sensitive Species, Special Designation Areas*  
M.A., Plant Science/Biology, University of Colorado at Denver  
B.A., Environmental Studies, University of Kansas

Dale Lindeman, *GIS and Visual Resources*  
M.S., Geography, Oregon State University  
B.S., Wildlife Management, University of Wisconsin  
A.A., Columbia College

Jeff Bass, *Fire Management, Fire Ecology*  
B.S., Range Science, Utah State University

Jerry Barker, *Vegetation, Fire Ecology, Invasive Weeds*  
Ph.D., Range Ecology, Utah State University  
M.S., Range Ecology, Utah State University  
B.S., Botany, Brigham Young University

Joan Gaidos, *Soil Resources*  
Ph.D., Crop and Soil Environmental Science, Virginia Tech  
M.S., Animal Science, University of Kentucky  
B.S., Animal Science, Virginia Tech

Pius Sanabani, *Air Quality*  
M.S., Mechanical Engineering, University of Miami  
B.S., Mechanical Engineering, University of Miami  
H.N.D., College of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt

### 5.2.2 BLM ID Team

Sherry Hirst, *Team Lead*  
Zone Kingman/Phoenix Field Offices - Fire and Fuels NEPA coordinator and Environmental Planner  
Kingman, AZ  
14 years of experience

Dave Mueller, *Fuels Management Specialist/ COR*  
Arizona State Office  
16 years of experience

Mark Pater, *Fire Ecologist/Rangeland Management Specialist*  
Stafford/Tucson Field Office  
16 years of experience

Hillary Boyd, *Fire Ecologist/Wildlife Biologist and T&E Specialist*  
Fire Ecologist Arizona Strip Field Office  
9 years of experience

Paul Hobbs, *Soil Scientist/Soil, Water & Air Specialist*  
Kingman Field Office  
23 years of experience

Patricia Bailey, *Planning & Environmental Coordinator*  
Yuma Field Office  
2 years of experience

James McCray, *Fuels Management Specialist*  
Assistant Fire Manager for Fuels Yuma Field Office  
25 years of experience

Lisa Stapp, *Management Assistant/ Administrative Coordinator*  
Lake Havasu Field Office  
16 years of experience

Timothy Duck, *Ecologist*  
Ecologist Parashant National Monument  
St. George, UT  
22 years of experience

### **5.2.3 Contributing Interdisciplinary Team Members**

Bill Coulloudon, *Rangeland Management Specialist*  
Arizona State Office  
27 years of experience

Ted Cordery, *T&E Specialist*  
Arizona State Office

Gary Stumpf, *Archeologist*  
Arizona State Office  
26 years of experience

Bill Grossi, *Wildlife Biologist*  
Arizona State Office

Jim Renthall, *Soil, Water & Air Specialist*  
Arizona State Office  
25 years of experience

Bruce Olson, *Fuels Technician Liaison*  
Phoenix Field Office  
1 year of experience

Ken Moore, *Forester*  
Arizona State Office  
8 years of experience

LD Walker, *Weed Specialist*  
Arizona State Office

Jack Johnson, *GIS Specialist*  
Arizona State Office

Mike Fisher, *Fire Management Specialist*  
Arizona State Office  
27 years of experience

Rebecca Davidson, *Land and Resource Planning Coordinator - Liaison*  
Arizona Game and Fish Department  
6 years of experience

Gregg Simmons, *Planning and NEPA Program Lead*  
Arizona State Office  
28 years of experience

Carrie Templin, *External Affairs*  
Arizona State Office

## **5.3 BLM Response to Public Comment Letters Received**

Arizona BLM released a preliminary Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and supporting EA on September 26, 2003, seeking public review and comment on our intent to find no significant impact as documented in the supporting EA. The comment period closed October 27, 2003. Seven public comment letters were received, six of which contained comments needing a response. **Table 5.1**, BLM Response to Public Comment Letters Received, provides a summary of BLM responses to specific comments.

All public comments received will be available for public review at Bureau of Land Management, 222 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004, during regular business hours (8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays.

**Table 5.1 ñ BLM Response to Public Comment Letters Received**

Commenter	Comment	Response
<p>Tom Fry Wildfire Program Coordinator Four Corners Regional Office The Wilderness Society 1660 Wynkoop Street, #850 Denver, CO 80202 303.650.5818x110 tom_fry@tws.org</p>	<p>Given the geographic scope of the plan amendment, the diversity in both the human and physical landscapes within the state of Arizona, and the outdated environmental documentation that this LUP amendment is tiered to, we are concerned that an Environmental Assessment is an inadequate level of analysis.</p> <p>Of additional concern are several suppositions and apparent errors contained within the analysis.</p> <p>Regardless of the value/resource in question, the No-Action Alternative is nearly uniformly portrayed as follows: "The No -Action Alternative would result in no new impacts" The primary impact would be the continuation of periodic wildfires" It is anticipated that the number and acres burned will increase in future years following the trend in past years" Under the No -Action Alternative, hazardous fuels will continue to accumulate in the vegetation communities at rates respective to past years" (EA at 4 -8)"</p> <p>Certainly the supposition of this argument may apply to certain vegetation communities but not to all. Further, this assertion, in its generality, is misleading, and you have provided no support for the assertion of increasing fuel accumulations.</p> <p>Another issue that we would like to make you aware of deals with a more specific statement occurring in reference to section 4.4.2, the environmental consequences of the proposed action to vegetation communities. The EA states: "The landscape under the Proposed Action would be divided into four fire management categories regardless of vegetation community. The fire management categories would be defined based on the wildfire threat to human life and property, and historic fire return intervals."</p> <p>Surely the division of fire management categories (A-D) will be described at the site-specific level according to vegetation communities. Vegetation communities are an indicator of fire return interval and cannot be taken in account independently of each other. We expect that the four BLM individual fire management zones and their respective FMPs will taken into consideration vegetation communities as a function of fire return intervals in defining the boundaries of fire management categories.</p> <p>We understand that this LUP amendment is to be used as a planning tool to give direction in the preparation of updated and compliant Fire Management Plans for the four fire planning areas on BLM lands within the state of Arizona. As such, we expect that a more thorough and detailed examination of specific landscape conditions will occur in these planning processes and directly influence specific management actions. We appreciate your consideration in informing us when these more site-specific planning processes will occur so that we might offer site-specific relevant information and comment.</p> <p>We would like to commend the BLM office for recognizing that It is expected that acreage allocations in each of the four fire management categories will change over time with acreage in categories B and C gradually declining and acreage in category D gradually increasing.</p> <p>We likewise applaud the EA's recognition that naturally occurring fire is a critical process to ecosystem health and underscoring this recognition by both amending an existing policy of suppressing all fires regardless of ignition source or location and removing prescribed burning acreage limitations.</p> <p>While our reservations concerning the quality of environmental review are outstanding, we appreciate the trajectory that this document sets in the future of fire management on BLM lands within the state of Arizona.</p>	<p>The categories (A-D) are based on vegetation and also resource management objectives. We agree that vegetative communities are the causal factors for the identification of fire return intervals. More specific information will be provided in BLM's Fire Management Plans (FMPs) to meet the resource objectives as stated.</p>
<p>Gary V. Christensen P.O. Box 308 Springerville, AZ 85938</p>	<p>The goals (Desired Future Conditions, pg 2) identified in this plan are desirable and achievable. With conditions as they are we need to be very careful with controlled burning, but be willing to accept some risk to achieve the goals. Most knowledgeable persons now realize the benefits of fire as it relates to a healthy environment. Once the goals have been achieved commitment must be made to maintain the desired condition. Most government agencies seem to have short term goals, but no long term commitments.</p> <p>If the BLM really wants to do something positive for these resources it needs to solve the range abuse problems. I realize that this amendment relates to fire, fuel loads and air quality, but domestic livestock grazing as it exists at present is much more detrimental to the land than fire have ever been.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment [no change necessary].</p>
<p>Yuma Valley Rod &amp; Gun Club, Inc. P.O. Box 10450 Yuma, AZ 85366</p>	<p>In particular, the FONSI [Finding of No Significant Impact] is clearly adequate in determination that the amendment is not a major Federal Action and will have no significant effect on the quality of the human environment, other than those previously addressed in aforementioned Environmental Impact Statements (EIS). The YVRGC [Yuma Valley Rod and Gun Club] also concludes a new or supplemental EIS is unnecessary and should not be prepared.</p> <p>If there is any concern to be addressed by our organization, it is the assurance that BLM State Director Zielinski, Director Shroufe of the Arizona Game and Fish Department and Mr. Coffeen of US Fish and Wildlife Service Ecological Services mutually agree, prior to any projects taking place. This will ensure litigation expenses (should they occur) to remain minimal.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment [no change necessary].</p>
<p>Kathleen Hemenway, PhD Senior Consultant, Wildfire Panel National Academy of Public Admin. PO Box 2109 Snowflake, AZ 85937</p>	<p>Thank you very much for sending me a copy of the LUP. It is very nice.</p>	<p>No change necessary.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Response
<p>Rebecca Davidson Land and Resource Planning Coordinator Arizona Game and Fish Department</p>	<p><u>1. Readability/Clarification:</u></p> <p>We appreciate the clarity in the document that specifies that the Department will be included in future planning efforts to address federally protected species in site-specific Fire Management Plans (page 2-4). However, it is not clear how fire management activities that may affect other non-listed, yet sensitive and important species and/or their habitats might be addressed in cooperative efforts with the Department. Both big game and nongame species are described in detail in the Affected Environment Section and Appendices (pages 3-19, 3-20 and Appendix C), yet it is unclear how the Habitat Management Plans that are developed cooperatively between the Department and BLM (pages 2-14 Sikes Act, 3-19 MOU) will relate and integrate with the Fire Management Plans to ensure that any wildlife-related species concerns, whether federally listed or not, will be considered and addressed when fire management plans are developed and implemented.</p> <p>The LUP Amendment, because of its programmatic nature, covers fire management on a large scale across Arizona. It should be clarified in the document that not all BLM lands and vegetation communities in Arizona would be subject to the same intensities of fire management activities.</p> <p>For instance, Table 3.4 ñ To clarify which vegetation communities were historically fire adapted and are now more likely to have active fire management prescriptions, include the fire return rate (mentioned in the text as examples on page 3-8) for each vegetation community. This will better assist a reader in understanding that not every vegetation community would fall under every management prescription. The desired future conditions, now listed in Appendix C, might also be included within this table to further describe how fire might be used as a tool to promote ecological function, but would be based on the historic and current nature of each vegetation community.</p> <p>Appendix E ñ For each Herd Management Area (HMA) not incorporated by reference (page 3-18), and therefore described in Appendix E, please include the Appropriate Management Levels (AML) of burros and/or horses that were established in Herd Management Plans in addition to, or instead of an estimated population. This will ensure that estimated populations are not mistaken for the AML. For instance, the Cibola-Trigo HMA has a current estimated number of 300 burros (as written); however the AML set for this HMA is 165 burros.</p> <p><u>2. Format/Content:</u></p> <p>Page 1-4 ñ Section 1.5 references incorrectly Table 2.2, iExisting LUP Decisionsi ñ text should reference Table 2.3.</p> <p>Table 3.4 ñ Elevation and Precipitation in table are listed in feet and inches (respectively), however the vegetation communities described in Appendix C have these same components listed in meters and centimeters (respectively). Ensure consistency within document.</p> <p>Table 3.4 and Figure 3.4 ñ Ensure that Vegetation Community types match between map and table. For instance, the table lists Great Basin Conifer Woodland, the map lists Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland.</p> <p>Appendix C (Vegetation Communities and Associated Wildlife Species) ñ In July 2003, the Department provided comments on wildlife species representative of each vegetation community. However, these comments have not been incorporated into this latest version dated September 2003. The species information we provided included a more accurate account of those species that are representative of specific vegetation communities, replacing those that were uncommon, rare, outside their range, or have been extirpated entirely from Arizona. Other keystone and important species, including both big and small game species, were recommended for inclusion. We again include these recommendations in table format as an attachment to this letter.</p> <p>Appendix F (F-4) ñ Desert Pupfish (<i>Cyprinodon macularius</i>) ñ edit to species description: When the desert pupfish was listed as endangered on March 31, 1986, the listing included the Quitobaquito pupfish, which at the time was a subspecies of desert pupfish. However, recent genetic work has suggested that the Quitobaquito and the desert pupfish be recognized as full species (<i>C. eremus</i> and <i>C. macularius</i>, respectively).</p> <p>No natural populations of <i>C. macularius</i> remain in Arizona. In Arizona, reintroduced populations exist only at Cold Springs (Graham County) and Lousy Canyon (Yavapai County). AD Wash (Maricopa County) was stocked in 1993, but persisted for only a short time and pupfish have not been collected there since 1993. Therefore, only two reintroduction sites are considered extant, Cold Springs and Lousy Canyon. The population of pupfish established at Finley Tank in the 1970s is of questionable heritage originating from the University of Arizona, and is of limited value to conservation and recovery purposes.</p> <p>Critical habitat designations are primarily pertinent to Quitobaquito pupfish. These critical habitat segments are located upstream of BLM lands in Arizona and are outside the proposed action area in California.</p> <p>Appendix F (F-4) ñ Gila topminnow (<i>Poeciliopsis occidentalis</i>) ñ edit to species description: Currently, disjunct populations exist in 14 natural locations and 17 reestablished locations within the Gila River drainage and one location in the Bill Williams River drainage. Of the reintroduced locations, 15 are in spring habitats.</p> <p>References ñ Correct the third reference listed on page R-1: Should read Wildlife 2006. Not 2005.</p> <p>Add to references (from Appendix C, Table C2): Arizona Game and Fish Department. Hunt Arizona 2002 Edition ñ Survey, Harvest and Hunt Data for Big and Small Game.</p> <p>The Department supports an adaptive management approach to manage natural fire starts for the benefit of natural resources, to utilize prescribed fire as a tool to promote ecological function, and to allow for change in suppression responses for varying circumstances. Again, we appreciate the continued efforts by BLM to ensure that the LUP Amendment was developed cooperatively and that decisions impacting wildlife resources were made with the support of the Arizona Game and Fish Department.</p>	<p>BLM and Arizona G&amp;F will continue to cooperate as outlined in the agency's MOU.</p> <p>Figure 3.5 provides clarification for the location of various fire adapted vegetative communities and also illustrates the fire return frequency. Figure 3.6 displays the condition class of these vegetative communities as related to the historic fire return frequency. AML references have been removed. Change table to 2.3.</p> <p>Change elevation and precipitation to feet and inches in Appendix C.</p> <p>Vegetation community types matched.</p> <p>Change made.</p> <p>Review changes made to BE and include those changes in the EA.</p> <p>Insert additional references.</p>