

Chapter 5.0 Consultation and Coordination

5.1 Introduction

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations provided by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) require the involvement of agencies and the general public during the preparation and review of Environmental Impact Statements (EISs). This chapter documents coordination and consultation that has occurred with agencies, Native Americans, and the public during scoping for the proposed project, during public meetings on the Draft EIS (DEIS), and during preparation of this Final EIS (FEIS). This chapter also identifies agencies and the public who provided comments on the DEIS. Appendix I contains those comments and BLM's responses.

5.2 Public Scoping

Scoping is the process of learning the concerns of individuals, organizations, and agencies regarding a proposed project. Scoping is an integral part of the NEPA review process because it allows interested parties to participate in developing a list of issues that will be discussed in an EIS. Public scoping for the MFP Amendment/Toquop Energy Project EIS was comprised of three separate scoping efforts:

- Scoping for the Pah Rah/Toquop Land Exchange Environmental Assessment—Conducted by the BLM during July 2001
- Scoping for the Toquop Energy Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)—Conducted by the BLM during July and August 2001

- Scoping for the combined Toquop Energy Project and Pah Rah/Toquop Land Exchange EIS, requiring an amendment to the Caliente Management Framework Plan—Conducted by BLM during November and December 2001

5.2.1 Public Scoping for the Pah Rah/Toquop Land Exchange

Public scoping meetings were held on July 10, 2001, in Mesquite, and July 11, 2001, in Reno. The meetings were conducted using an open-house format. BLM representatives posted maps showing the exchange parcels, provided photographs of the sites, and discussed concerns with individuals. The Mesquite meeting was attended by 14 individuals and the Reno meeting was attended by 11 individuals. The meetings were advertised through notices in the Mesquite, Lincoln County, and Reno newspapers and individual mailings.

Concerns voiced at the meetings were summarized in a memorandum dated July 20, 2001. Written comments were also submitted to the BLM after the meetings. Most of the commentors were not in favor of the land exchange, and those that did not state a position had questions about particular impacts. The number of comments provided in each resource category were as follows (from highest number of comments to lowest):

- Wildlife habitat, or general habitat concerns: 6 comments
- Cultural and historical resources: 4 comments

- Economic value of land: 3 comments
- Water development: 2 comments
- Visual resources: 1 comment
- Recreation: 1 comment
- Other concerns: 4 comments
 - Combine land exchange and power plant NEPA process: 2 comments
 - Mapping is inaccurate: 1 comment
 - Land exchange is not valid under regulations: 1 comment

5.2.2 Public Scoping for the Toquop Energy Project

Public involvement for the Toquop Energy Project was initiated with public information meetings held in Caliente, Nevada, on July 11, 2001, and Mesquite, Nevada, on July 12, 2001. These meetings were advertised in the local newspapers in Lincoln County, Mesquite, and Las Vegas, as well as in individual mailings.

The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the EIS on the Toquop Energy Project was published in the *Federal Register* on July 22, 2001. Notice of a public meeting was advertised in the NOI; in local newspapers in Lincoln County, Mesquite, and Las Vegas; and in individual mailings. A public scoping meeting was held in Las Vegas on August 15, 2001.

An open-house format was used at each meeting where project and BLM representatives presented project information on display boards and handouts, and discussed concerns with individuals. The Caliente meeting was attended by 14 people, 39 people attended the Mesquite meeting, and 25 attended the Las Vegas meeting.

Concerns voiced at the meetings were written on flip charts. Written comments were also submitted to the BLM during and after the meetings. Comments fell into three broad categories, each of which is described below:

- Those in favor of the project
- Those who are concerned about the potential impacts of the project
- Those who did not state a position, but if the project happens, want local union labor to be employed

5.2.2.1 Favor the Project

Three of the commentors favored the project, indicating that the site would not have serious environmental consequences.

5.2.2.2 Concerned About the Potential Impacts of the Project

Many commentors were concerned about potential impacts or suggested questions that should be answered in the DEIS. The number of comments provided in each resource category were as follows (from highest number of comments to lowest):

- Water development, use, and ground water impacts: 16 comments
- Habitat, wildlife, ACEC, and WSA concerns: 15 comments
- Air quality: 4 comments
- Economic value of land for exchange: 1 comment
- Noise : 1 comment
- Soils: 1 comment

- Economics (tax contribution not enough to cover ecological costs): 1 comment
- Other concerns: 6 comments, as listed below:
 - Combine land exchange and power plant NEPA process: 1 comment
 - Mesquite and Clark County would get pollution but no economic boost: 1 comment
 - Lack of comprehensive plan for the power plant: 1 comment
 - No Arizona or Mohave County officials informed of project: 1 comment
 - Evaluate cumulative effects of all proposed power plants: 1 comment
 - Provide complete index of all generation due to come on line and the expected rolling blackouts to determine project need: 1 comment

5.2.2.3 Local Union Labor for Project

Many of those who attended the public meetings were concerned that if an out-of-state company were selected to construct the Toquop Energy facility, the chosen firm would bring in out-of-state workers to build the plant. Ten people submitted written comments that local union labor should be used. Although it was not within the scope of the DEIS to dictate what labor force would be used to build the plant, the evaluation of socioeconomic resources in the DEIS addressed this topic.

5.2.3 Public Scoping for the Toquop Land Disposal Amendment to the Caliente MFP/Toquop Energy Project

In reviewing the comments received during the two scoping processes

described above, the BLM determined that calls to combine the two NEPA processes had merit. It was also determined that the Pah Rah/Toquop Land Exchange required an amendment to the Caliente Management Framework Plan. Consequently, the decision was made to combine these actions into a single EIS and to reopen the scoping process for the expanded project.

The NOI to prepare an EIS for the Toquop Land Disposal Amendment to the Caliente MFP/Toquop Energy Project was published in the *Federal Register* on November 7, 2001. The Notice was also published in local newspapers in Lincoln County, Mesquite, and Las Vegas. The public comment period closed on December 7, 2001. The scoping process for both the Pah Rah/Toquop Land Exchange EA and the Toquop Energy Project EIS included public scoping meetings. The BLM determined that further public scoping meetings were duplicative and unnecessary for the expanded EIS.

Fifteen comment letters were received. The following issues were identified:

- Consider an air-cooled plant as an alternative (3 comments)
- Concern over impacts of ground water withdrawal on surface water and fish and wildlife (9 comments)
- Concern over air quality impacts (4 comments)
- Concern over compliance with NEPA, Land Exchange Rules, and state statutes (7 comments)
- Impacts to cultural resources (2 comment)

- Impacts to natural resources from facilities (2 comments)
- Concern over comparable values of the parcels involved in the land exchange (4 comments)

5.3 Coordination During MFP Amendment/Toquop Energy Project DEIS Development

5.3.1 General Consultation

The agencies and Indian Tribes listed below were consulted during the preparation of the DEIS. Specific references citing individuals, as appropriate, are provided in the text of this document. Agencies and Indian Tribes consulted include the following:

- Federal
 - Bureau of Land Management, Ely Field Office, Nevada
 - Bureau of Land Management, Carson City Field Office, Nevada
 - Bureau of Land Management Las Vegas Field Office, Nevada
 - Natural Resources Conservation Service
 - Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Las Vegas Office, Nevada
 - National Park Service (NPS), Denver, Colorado
 - Bureau of Indian Affairs
- State
 - Nevada Division of Wildlife (NDOW), Reno, Nevada
 - Nevada Department of Transportation
 - Nevada Public Utility Commission (NPUC)
 - Nevada State Historic Preservation Office

- Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), Reno, Nevada—Water Pollution Control Bureau
- Nevada Division of Environmental Protection—Air Quality Bureau
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality—Division of Air Quality
- Utah Department of Environmental Quality—Division of Air Quality
- Nevada Division of Water Resources

- County
 - Lincoln County Planning Department
 - Clark County Department of Air Quality Management
 - Lincoln County Sheriff’s Department
 - Washoe County Department of Community Development
 - Clark County Department of Comprehensive Planning
- Indian Tribes
 - Moapa Band of Paiutes
 - Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
 - Shivwits Band (Utah)
 - Las Vegas Paiute Tribe
 - Kaibab Paiute Tribe (Arizona)

5.3.2 Native American Consultation

Native American consultation occurred initially in relation to a land exchange proposal, now an alternative component of the Toquop Energy Project. Consultation with American Indian tribes also was initiated specifically in regard to the Toquop Energy Project itself.

5.3.2.1 Pah Rah-Toquop Wash Land Exchange

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Carson City Field Office, initiated consultation with Native Americans regarding the proposed Pah Rah-Toquop Wash land exchange on October 25, 2000. Letters went to Chairpersons of the Moapa Band of Paiutes, the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, and the Shivwits Band (Utah), all representatives of the ethnographic Southern Paiute who inhabited the Toquop Wash area at the time of historic contact. The letter described the specific location of public land in Lincoln County (T11S, R69E, Section 36) and gave a general location for the offered private land in Washoe County. Each tribe was asked for comments regarding cultural values, issues or concerns, and to identify any other persons or groups who should be informed of the proposed land exchange. Subsequently, telephone calls were made to Chairpersons to initiate data collection about Native American concerns. At the request of the tribes, two other groups (Las Vegas Paiute Tribe, Kaibab Paiute Tribe) and one individual (Richard Arnold, Pahrump, Nevada) were informed of the project and asked for statements of any concern. Efforts also have been made to help ensure that newly elected tribal Chairpersons were informed of the project as BLM learned of their elective status.

Tribes expressing interest in consultation included the Moapa Band of Paiutes, the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, and the Shivwits Band, while the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe responded that they did not desire involvement in the consultation process; no responses were received from the other tribe or individual. The Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah responded in a letter of December 11, 2000, expressing concerns

about possible project-related effects on the Salt Song Trail. The Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah also requested a better map and requested an ethnographic study. The Chair and another member of the Moapa Band of Paiutes made a field examination of the Toquop Wash parcel in January 2001. Representatives of the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah and the Shivwits Band, and again the Chair of the Moapa Band of Paiutes, also made a field visit that same month. Examples of known archaeological resources were visited, and the Salt Song Trail was discussed generally. The BLM maintained telephone contact in ensuing weeks and months in an effort to establish whether the tribes' concerns for possible effects on the Salt Song Trail were any different after the field inspection. However, no response was received.

In June 2001, the BLM sent a letter and consultation summary to the Moapa Band of Paiutes, the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, the Shivwits Band, the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe, the Kaibab Paiute Tribe, and Richard Arnold. The BLM letter conveyed results of the cultural resources inventory, as well as the BLM's conclusion that no tribe had identified the Salt Song Trail or related sites as being within the Toquop Wash land exchange parcel, and that no tribe had identified any possible effects to the Salt Song Trail if the proposed exchange were implemented.

In July 2001, the newly elected Chairperson of the Moapa Band of Paiutes expressed concerns in a public scoping meeting held in regard to the proposed land exchange. A specific concern was expressed for the Salt Song Trail, which was identified by the chairman as a sacred site. A general location was given to the BLM representative. The Salt Song Trail was described as a trail along which ancestral spirits move as songs are sung by

contemporary members of the Moapa Band of Paiutes (and perhaps other persons as well). No information was received as to how or whether the contemporary practitioners physically utilize the proposed project area in conducting their sacred rituals. The chairman asserted that the spirits' movements might be hindered or precluded by projects such as the proposed land exchange and developments that would occur there. In July 2001, the BLM sent letters to the Moapa Band of Paiutes, the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, and the Shivwits Band restating the BLM's need for a more specific location of the Salt Song Trail with relation to the proposed Toquop Wash land exchange parcel. The BLM also indicated the need for information as to how the proposed land exchange action would affect the significance, use, or integrity of the Salt Song Trail. No responses have been received to date.

Northern Nevada tribes were asked for any expressions of concern for the offered private land in Washoe County, in the Pah Rah Range. BLM opened formal communication with the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony in January 2001. The first made an onsite field visit by a tribal elder and the Washoe Tribe's cultural resources coordinator, while the tribal chairmen of the other two made visual inspections. No concerns were expressed about potential effects of the proposed land exchange.

5.3.2.2 Toquop Energy Project

The BLM, Ely Field Office, initiated consultation regarding the proposed Toquop Energy Project in December 2001 with Chairpersons of five tribes, including the Moapa Band of Paiutes, the Paiute

Indian Tribe of Utah, the Shivwits Band (Utah), the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe, and Kaibab Paiute Tribe. The tribes were asked if they had any cultural values, issues, or concerns that might be affected by the proposed action. The BLM, Ely Field Office, had also initiated contact in November 2001 in a monthly tribal coordination meeting attended by the Ely Shoshone Tribe. No concerns were expressed in that meeting. The letters were followed by telephone calls to continue data collection.

Most initial calls were made in December 2001 to tribal Chairs, while one (to the Moapa Band of Paiutes) was made in January 2002 after the outcome of a tribal Chair election late in December 2001. Telephone contact was made with the Chairpersons of the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, the Moapa Band of Paiutes and the Shivwits Band. Telephone contact was also made with the Tribal Attorney for the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe and with a cultural resources specialist in the Natural Resources Division of the Kaibab Paiute Tribe. In two cases, the tribes contacted by telephone requested copies of the original certified letters which were resent by facsimile transmission. In one case, the original certified letter had been undeliverable so the facsimile copy was sent.

The Paiute Tribe of Utah initially expressed interest in continued consultation but ultimately indicated it had no concerns about the project. The Shivwits Band indicated that: 1) it was concerned about the preservation of archaeological sites; and 2) that, based on information from its members who made the on-site inspection in January 2001, the Salt Song Trail did not extend as far as the project area. The Las Vegas Paiute Tribe had no concerns about the project. No

additional information has been received from either the Moapa Band of Paiutes or the Kaibab Paiute Tribe.

5.4 Request for Comments on the Draft Caliente MFP Amendment/Toquop Energy Project DEIS

5.4.1 Distribution

Through the consultation and coordination process, interested parties can review and comment on the substantive issues presented in the DEIS and other study documents. The DEIS was sent to, and comments requested from, the members of the public and other individuals who attended public meetings. It was also sent to the entities listed below.

Federal Government

Arizona Strip Field Office, BLM
Battle Mountain Field Office, BLM
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Caliente Field Station, BLM
Carson City Field Office, BLM
Cedar City Field Office, BLM
Dixie Field Office, BLM
Ely Field Office, BLM
Las Vegas Field Office, BLM
National Park Service
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Nevada State Office, BLM
St. George Field Office, BLM
U.S. Air Force
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Bureau of Mines
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Department of Energy
U.S. Department of Interior
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Forest Service

U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. National Park Service

State Government

Nevada Commission for the Preservation of Wild Horses
Nevada Division of Agriculture
Nevada Division of Conservation District
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
Nevada Division of Minerals
Nevada Division of State Lands
Nevada Division of State Parks
Nevada Division of Water Resources
Nevada Division of Wildlife
Nevada Grazing Advisory Board
Nevada Indian Commission
Nevada Legislative Committee on Public Lands
Nevada Natural Heritage Program
Nevada State Clearinghouse
Nevada State Historic Preservation Office
Nevada Wildlife Commission

Local Governments

Alamo Town Board
City of Caliente
City of Mesquite
City of Reno
City of Sparks
Clark County Commission
Enterprise City Advisory Council
Lincoln County Commission
Lincoln County Conservation District
Lincoln County Game Board
Lincoln County Public Lands Commission
Pioche Town Advisory Board
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission
Washoe County Commission

Tribal Governments

Kaibab Paiute Tribe (Arizona)
Las Vegas Paiute Tribe

Moapa Band of Paiutes
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe
Reno-Sparks Indian Colony
Shivwits Band (Utah)
Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California
Yerington Paiute Tribe

Other Organizations

American Land Conservancy
Animal Protection Institute
Audubon Society
Best in the Desert
Center for Biological Diversity
Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife
Desert Research Institute
Fraternity of Desert Bighorn
Friends of Nevada Wilderness
Groundshaker Motorcycle Club
Lincoln County Power
Mineral Policy Center
Mojave-Southern Great Basin Resource
Advisory Council
Motorcycle Racers Association of
Southern Nevada
Mule Deer Foundation
Native American Heritage Commission
Natural Resources Defense Council
Nature Conservancy
Nevada Bell
Nevada Bighorns Unlimited
Nevada Cattlemen's Association
Nevada Conservation League
Nevada Indian Environmental Coalition
Nevada Mining Association
Nevada Outdoor Recreation Association
Nevada Power Company
Nevada Wilderness Association
Nevada Wilderness Project
Nevada Wildlife Federation
Nevada Woolgrowers Association
Northern Nevada Native Plant Society
Overton Power District
Paiute Pipeline Company
People for the USA
Sierra Club

Sierra Pacific Power Company
Silverdust Racing Association
Southern Nevada Off Road Racing
Enthusiasts
Southern Nevada Water Authority
State Multiple Use Advisory Commission
for Federal Lands
Trust for Public Land
Virgin Valley Water District
Western Land Exchange
Wild Horse Organized Assistance
Wilderness Society
Wildlife Society, Nevada Chapter
Williams Gas Pipeline
Wyoming Advocates for Animals

Governmental Officials

Shelley Berkley, U.S. House of
Representatives
Marcia DeBraga, Nevada State Assembly
John Ensign, U.S. Senate
James A. Gibbons, U.S. House of
Representatives
Kenny Guinn, Governor
Mike McGinnis, Nevada State Senate
Harry M. Reid, U.S. Senate

5.4.2 Availability

Copies of the Draft MFP
Amendment/Toquop Energy Project DEIS
were available for public inspection at the
BLM offices listed below.

Bureau of Land Management
Caliente Field Station
U.S. Highway 93
Caliente, NV 89008-0237

Bureau of Land Management
Carson City Field Office
5665 Morgan Mill Road
Carson City, NV 89701

Bureau of Land Management
Ely Field Office
702 North Industrial Way
Ely, NV 89301-9408

Bureau of Land Management
Nevada State Office
1340 Financial Boulevard
Reno, NV 89502-7147

Bureau of Land Management
Washington Office of Public Affairs
18th and C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20240

Copies of the Draft MFP Amendment/
DEIS were available for public inspection
at the libraries listed below.

Caliente Branch Library
P.O. Box 306
Caliente, NV 89008

Clark County Library
1401 East Flamingo Road
Las Vegas, NV 89109

Las Vegas Public Library
1726 East Charleston Boulevard
Las Vegas, NV 89104

Lincoln County Library
P.O. Box 330
Pioche, NV 89043

Mesquite Library
121 West 1st North Street
Mesquite, NV 89027

North Las Vegas Library
2300 Civic Center
North Las Vegas, NV 89030

Panaca High School Library
P.O. Box 268
Panaca, NV 89042

University of Nevada-Las Vegas
James R. Dickinson Library
Documents Department
4505 South Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89154

University of Nevada-Reno
Getchell Library
Government Publication Dept.
Reno, NV 89507

Washoe County Library
301 South Center Street
Reno, NV 89501

White Pine County Library
950 Campton Street
Ely, NV 89301

5.5 Request for comments on the Notice of Exchange Proposal ("NOEP")

5.5.1 Purpose

BLM must publish a NOEP upon entering into an Agreement to Initiate an Exchange (ATI) with a land exchange proponent. BLM signed an ATI with NLRC on April 22, 2002, for this proposed land exchange. The NOEP serves the following three purposes:

- Advises the public of the opportunity to participate in the NEPA process by inviting comments on the land exchange proposal
- Notifies all authorized users and others who may have interests in or claims against the properties
- Provides notice to jurisdictional state and local governments and the congressional delegation

5.5.2 Distribution

The NOEP was published weekly for 4 consecutive weeks in local newspapers serving the Mesquite area, and both Lincoln and Washoe County, Nevada. In addition, the NOEP was sent to, and comments requested from the members of the public and other individuals who attended public meetings and to those entities similarly listed in *Section 5.4.1, Distribution*.

5.6 Public Meetings

Four public meetings were held during the public comment period (May 31 to August 29, 2002) to receive comments on the DEIS. Dates and locations of these meetings, and the number of attendees, are as follows:

Caliente, Nevada (6 Attendees)

Date: July 8, 2002
Time: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.
Location: Caliente City Hall
100 Depot Avenue
Caliente, Nevada

Las Vegas, Nevada (15 Attendees)

Date: July 9, 2002
Time: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.
Location: BLM
Las Vegas Field Office
4701 Torrey Pines Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada

Mesquite, Nevada (3 Attendees)

Date: July 10, 2002
Time: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.
Location: Mesquite City Hall
Training Rooms A and B
10 East Mesquite Boulevard
Mesquite, Nevada

Reno, Nevada (4 Attendees)

Date: July 11, 2002
Time: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.
Location: Airport Plaza Hotel
1981 Terminal Way
Reno, Nevada

5.7 Coordination During MFP Amendment/Toquop Energy Project FEIS Development

This FEIS has been developed through continued coordination efforts among the BLM and many of the entities listed in *Section 5.3.1, General Consultation*. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) requested and was granted cooperating agency status for this FEIS. Jurisdictional delineations of waters of the United States were reviewed by Grady McNure of the USACE during a site visit / consultation on November 14, 2002. The Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Water Quality, was consulted on December 5, 2002, to confirm permits necessary for crossing and/or discharging to waters of the State and State-USACE jurisdictional responsibilities.

Coordination efforts were directed by the Ely Field Office of the BLM, and were supported by the Carson City and Las Vegas Field Offices of the BLM. Meetings were held among the various entities and with the project proponent, and correspondence was exchanged to discuss and resolve issues and concerns identified by the public during meetings and in their written comments on the DEIS. A noteworthy outcome of this coordination and consultation process and of public comments on the DEIS is the presentation and analysis of an additional action alternative (Alternative 3) in this *Proposed Toquop Land Disposal Amendment to the*

Caliente MFP and FEIS for the Toquop Energy Project. Alternative 3 is an air-cooled, rather than a water-cooled, power plant.

5.7.1 Public Comments on the DEIS

The public comment period opened with the announcement of the availability of the Draft MFP Amendment/Toquop Energy Project EIS in the Federal Register on May 31, 2002. Public comments on the *Proposed Toquop Land Disposal Amendment to the Caliente MFP and FEIS for the Toquop Energy Project* were accepted until August 29, 2002. Four public meetings were held in July 2002, as described in *Section 5.5, Public Meetings*, and were attended by 28 people. The BLM received 159 separate pieces of correspondence containing comments on the DEIS during the comment period. Comments were received from three federal agencies, four state agencies, two local agencies, three interest groups, and 147 citizens. Table 5-1 lists the entities and individuals offering comments on the DEIS. In addition, the BLM received five letters on the Notice of Exchange Proposal (NOEP) for the land exchange, and those letters were considered in the preparation of this *Proposed Toquop Land Disposal Amendment to the Caliente MFP and FEIS for the Toquop Energy Project*.

Appendix I contains copies of the comment letters on the DEIS and the BLM's responses to those comments. Each comment letter was assigned a

reference number and reviewed. Each comment on the DEIS in the letter was identified with a number. The response to each comment is numbered with the same number as the comment and printed next to or near the comment letter in Appendix I. Responses were prepared for comments that presented new data, raised new issues, or disagreed with the impact conclusions. Where appropriate, changes or additions are reflected in the *Proposed Toquop Land Disposal Amendment to the Caliente MFP and FEIS for the Toquop Energy Project* to respond to comments.

5.8 List of Preparers and Reviewers

Early in the NEPA process, an interdisciplinary team (EIS ID Team) was formed within the lead agency to provide guidance and direction for preparing the EIS. The EIS ID Team members are listed in Table 5-2. Table 5-3 lists the EIS Core Team members, which represented the BLM Ely Field Office, Toquop Energy, Nevada Land and Resource Company, and CH2M HILL. The purpose of the EIS Core Team was to review interim work products to EIS preparation and to work through specific issues related to EIS preparation. Table 5-4 identifies reviewers from the BLM State Office, the BLM Carson City and Las Vegas Field Offices. Table 5-5 identifies the EIS Consultant Team, which was responsible for preparing the DEIS and this *Proposed Toquop Land Disposal Amendment to the Caliente MFP and FEIS for the Toquop Energy Project*.

TABLE 5-1
 Comment Letters on the Draft MFP Amendment/EIS

Reference Number	Source of Letter	
	Commenter	Agency
Federal Agencies		
F1	Lisa Hanf	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
F2	Trish Riley	U.S. Geological Survey
F3	Grady McNure	Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District
State Agencies		
S1	Carl Barrick	Nevada State Department of Water Resources
S2	Joeseh Del Grosso	Nevada Division of State Lands
S3	Rebecca Palmer	Nevada State Historic Preservation Office
S4	Doug Hunt	Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Local Agencies		
L1	Kay Brothers	Southern Nevada Water Authority
L2	Michael Winters	Virgin Valley Water District
Interest Groups		
G1	Rose Strickland	The Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club
G2	Christopher Krupp	Western Land Exchange Project
G3	Katie Fite	Committee for Idaho's High Desert
Citizens		
C1	John Link	
C2	Shirley Taylor	
C3	Robert Nard	
C4	John Torok	
C5	John Sutherland	
C6	Charles Hancock	

TABLE 5-1

Comment Letters on the Draft MFP Amendment/EIS

Citizen's Form Letter				
C7	Don Oliver	This same letter was submitted individually by 140 people. The signatures on 8 of the letters were completely illegible. All others are listed below.		
	A.J. Ledezma	Donald C. Perry	Jim Rogari	Robert G. Miller
	Aaron W. Cheinor	Doug Housemen	Joe Carlin	Robert Gang
	A(illegible) Pasqualott	Edward Collins	Joe Maestas	Robert Kye
	Albert D. Carroll	Edward Genning	Kenneth Ruth	Robert L. Moorman
	Albert T. McKinney	Elaine Solzner	Kenneth Troy Jensen	Ronald D. Johnson
	Ansil Aleong	Emil Yarbrough	Kevin Francis	Ronald V(illegible)
	B. (illegible)	Frederick W. True Jr.	Kevin Hinricksen	Ross Kitchen
	Barbara D. Gryder	Gary Gardner	Kevin Paramorr	Scott M. Freebairn
	Ben Grad	Gary M(illegible)	Larry F(illegible)	Scott N. Cameron
	B(illegible) Co(illegible)	Gary P. Thomsen	Lary D. Linville	Seth (illegible)
	Bobby E. Jamson	Gilbert Medina	Lori K. Claytom	Sidney Mitchell
	Bobby Lee (illegible)	Glenn Cadurell	Majilla D. Aspiras	Sigifredo Veloz
	Bonnie C(illegible)	Gordon Jackson	Mario N. Aspiras	Stephen L. Tichenor
	Bruce G. Ayer	Greg F(illegible)	Mark Carruth	Steve L. (illegible)
	C. Bookland	Greg Millisor	Mark J. Ashburn	Steve Schmitz
	C.W. Ramsey	Guadalupe Ponce	Martin Reed	Terry R. Larce
	Charles T. Stetson	Gustavo Lopez	Mat McLay	Thomas G. Connors
	C(illegible) E. C(illegible)	Harvey J. Ellison Jr.	Mathew Thomas	Thomas J. Surowiec
	Clifford B. Cihok Jr.	Hillary Holmes	Matt K(illegible)	Thomas Lawler
	Conrad W. Peel	Horace G. Smith, Jr.	Michael J. Harding	Timothy C. Powell
	Courtney Cole	(illegible) Cairnello	Michael T. Weinner	Tina L. Allen
	Crystal Lee Colvin	(illegible) Hadden	Michael Zielu (?)	Todd A. Williamson
	D. Scott Gossard	(illegible) Holz	Mike Ardoin	Tony Torres
	Dale T. Walsh	(illegible) X. (illegible)	Norman Benally	Troy Crooks
	Dalen Clayton	James A. Dinkfeld	Ralph D. Danise	Vernon L. Bradley
	Daniel F. Gryder	James Corpuz	Raymond D. Battiste	Virgil Whitaker
	Darin L. Ammer (illegible)	James Cozby	Reed Hahn	William A. Poma
	David R. Jones	James E. Kennedy	Ricardo L. Torrez	Robb L. Thompson
	David R. Thrush	James P(illegible)	Richard B. Lucas III	Jerry Lenox
	David Riggio	Jason Lockwood Jr.	Richard J. Auina	Donald Austin
	David S. Baker	Jason Sprigg	Rick J. Boy (?)	R(illegible) (illegible)
	David Sondin	Jeff Carothers	Rick Marsaw	Jennifer Chatham
	Dexter D. Lee	Jeffrey May	Ricki A. Casaday	Don Fletcher

TABLE 5-2
BLM EIS ID Team

Organization	Team Member	Role
Bureau of Land Management (EYFO)	Brenda Linnell	Realty Specialist/Rights-of-Way
	Pete Rowley (Contractor)	Water Resources Specialist
	Gretchen Burris	Wilderness Resources Specialist
	Michael Kuyper	Range Specialist
	Kristin May	Soils Specialist
	Alan B. Shepherd	Natural Resource Specialist
	Jeff Brower	Air and Water Quality Specialist
	Karen Prentice	Weeds
	William Smith	Wildlife Biologist

TABLE 5-3
EIS Core Team

Organization	Team Member	Role
Bureau of Land Management	Jeff Weeks	BLM, Ely Field Office, Management Review
	Dan Netcher	BLM Team Lead
	Mike Baughman (Contractor)	BLM EIS Project Manager
Toquop Energy	Pat King	Proponent
	Chris Garrett	Proponent
Nevada Land and Resource Company	Don Pattalock	Proponent
	Dave Buhlig	Realty Specialist—Land Exchange
	Tom Burke	Cultural Resources Specialist
CH2M HILL (Contractor)	Tom Haislip	Contractor EIS Project Manager
Lincoln County	Doug Carriger	Proponent

TABLE 5-4
Other Reviewers

Organization	Team Member	Role
Bureau of Land Management Nevada State Office	Brian Amme	Environmental Protection Specialist/ Planning
	Randy McNatt	Fish/Forestry Specialist
	Erick Campbell	Wildlife Biologist
	Jim Stobaugh	Lands Team Lead
	Dennis Samuelson	Realty Specialist
	Bill Brooks	Hydrologist/SMA Specialist
	Pat Barker	State Archaeologist
	Tom Burke	Assistant State Archaeologist
Bureau of Land Management Carson City Field Office	Paul Myers	Regional Economist
	Rick Brigham	Wildlife Resource Specialist
	Tom Crawford	Economist
	Jim deLaureal	Soils Specialist
	JoAnn Hufnagle	Realty Specialist—Lands
	Carla James	Minerals Specialist
	Dean Kinerson	Plant Specialist
	Terry Knight	Wilderness Specialist
	Terry Knutson	NEPA/Planning Specialist
	Terry Neumann	HAZMAT Specialist
	Pete Raffetto	Range Specialist
Bureau of Land Management Las Vegas Field Office	Jim Schroeder	Water Resource Specialist
	Margaret Waski	Cultural Resource Specialist
	Jackie Gratton	EIS/RMP Coordinator
	Jeff Steinmetz	Environmental Protection Specialist
	Donn Siebert	Natural Resources Specialist
	Gayle Marrs-Smith	Botanist
	Sharon McKelvey	Wildlife Biologist
	Kristen Murphy	Wildlife Biologist
Robert Bruno	Recreation Specialist	
Stanton Rolf	Archeologist	

TABLE 5-5
EIS Consultant Team

Organization	Team Member	Role	Qualifications
CH2M HILL	Tom Haislip	Project Manager	M.S., Ecology, University of Oklahoma; B.S., Zoology, Texas Christian University; 29 years of experience
	Randy Schulze	Toquop Program Manager	M.S., Environmental Engineering Sciences, University of Florida; B.A., Biological Sciences, University of South Florida; 22 years of experience
	Lynn Foster	EIS Coordinator	M.S., Fisheries, University of Wyoming; B.S., Biology, Ohio State University; 36 years of experience
	Phil Williams	Scoping and Alternatives Development	M.S., Biology, Eastern Washington University; B.S., Biology, Washington State University; 29 years of experience
	Mark Cochran	Biological Resources	Graduate studies in Zoology and Wildlife Management at the University of Michigan and Humboldt State University; BA, Biology, Grinnell College; 3 years of experience
	Bob Turner	Biological Resources	M.S., Wildlife Management, University of Nevada, Reno, 1985; B.S., Forest Management and Wildlife, Stephen F. Austin State University, Texas, 1977; A.A., Electronics, U.S. Army Missile & Munitions School, Huntsville, Alabama, 1973; 24 years of experience
	Frank Lewis	Water Resources	M.S., Hydrogeology, University of Arizona; B.A., Physical Geography/Ecosystem Analysis, University of California, Los Angeles; 17 years of experience
	Eden Britt	Water Resources	B.S., Zoology, University Of Florida, 1985; 17 years of experience
	Doug Huxley	Land and Physical Resources	B.S., Chemical and Petroleum Refining Engineering, Colorado School of Mines; 16 years of experience
	Monique Chaisson	EIS Coordinator/Land and Physical Resources	M.I.T., Environmental Compliance Management, College of Engineering & Applied Sciences, Arizona State University; B.A., Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, College of Arts & Sciences, University of Arizona; 14 years of experience
	Denny Mengel	Land and Physical Resources	Ph.D., Soil Sciences, North Carolina State University; M.S. Forestry, University of Idaho, B.S., Wildlife Resources, University of Idaho; 22 years of experience

TABLE 5-5
EIS Consultant Team

Organization	Team Member	Role	Qualifications
	Wendy Haydon	Land and Physical Resources/Socioeconomics	M.S., Recreation Administration, California State University, Sacramento; B.A., Environmental Studies, California State University, Sacramento; 18 years of experience
	Fatuma Yusuf	Socioeconomics	Ph.D., Washington State University; M.S., Washington State University; Master Of Arts, Washington State University; B.S. – University Of Nairobi; 7 years of experience
	John O'Connor	Socioeconomics	Ph.D., Agricultural Economics – Washington State University; M.S., Agricultural and Resource Economics – University of Maine; B.A., Economics – University Of North Carolina-Charlotte; 8 years of experience
	Regan Giese	Cultural Resources	M.A., Anthropology, New Mexico State University; B.L.S., Anthropology, St. Edwards University; 33 years of experience
	Eric Oden	Project Editor	M.A., Education, Boise State University; B.A., Education, Boise State University; 18 years of experience
	Janie Iseri	Lead Document Processor	A.G.S., Treasure Valley Community College; 16 years of experience
GeoMarine	Mark Slaughter	Cultural Resources	M.A., Anthropology, Eastern New Mexico University; B.A., History, Southwest Missouri University; 19 years of experience