

5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews agency consultation and coordination that occurred prior to and during preparation of this draft EIS. It also includes the list of agencies and individuals who received the draft document. The consultation process began with a Notice of Intent to prepare a draft RMP/EIS on June 4, 2003, as required under NEPA.

The BLM decision-making process is conducted in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality, and the policies and procedures used by the Department of Interior (DOI) and the BLM to implement NEPA. NEPA and its associated regulatory and policy framework require the following: 1) that all federal agencies involve interested groups of the public, as well as state and local governments, other federal agencies, and interested Tribes, in their decision-making process, 2) that a reasonable range of alternatives is developed, and 3) that all potential impacts of proposed actions and alternatives are disclosed.

The draft RMP/EIS was prepared by an interdisciplinary team of specialists from the Monticello Field Office (FO) and SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA), the third-party contractor hired to assist in the preparation of the RMP/EIS. The BLM and cooperating federal, state, and county agencies provided technical review and support.

This environmental document was prepared in consultation and coordination with various federal, state, and local agencies, organizations, and individuals. Agency consultation and public participation have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including scoping meetings, workshops, correspondence (both traditional and electronic), meetings with various public agencies and interest groups, and a series of informational bulletins. This section summarizes these activities.

5.2 SPECIFIC CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS

Federal laws require the BLM to consult with Native American Tribes, the State Historic Preservation Office, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) during the planning/NEPA decision-making process. This section documents the specific consultation and coordination efforts undertaken by the BLM throughout the entire process of developing the draft RMP/EIS.

5.2.1 TRIBES

The BLM is mandated to consult with Native American tribes concerning the identification of their cultural values, religious beliefs, and traditional practices that may be affected by actions on federal lands. Laws and executive orders requiring consultation include the following:

- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA)
- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA)
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (AIRFA)
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990, as amended (NAGPRA)
- Federal Land Management and Policy Act of 1976 (FLMPA)

- Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA)
- Executive Order 11593 - Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment
- Executive Order 12898 - Environmental Justice
- Executive Order 13007 - Indian Sacred Sites
- Executive Order 13175 - Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments

Additionally, the BLM has developed guidelines for consultation with Native American groups. BLM Manuals 8160 (*Native American Coordination and Consultation*; BLM 2003e) and H-8160-1 (*General Procedural Guidance for Native American Consultation*; BLM 2003f) provide consultation requirements and procedural guidance to ensure that the consultation record demonstrates "that the responsible manager has made a reasonable and good faith effort to obtain and consider appropriate Native American input in decision making" (H-8160-1, 2003f:4). Recommended procedures for initiating the consultation process include project notification, preferably by certified mail, follow-up contact (e.g., telephone calls), and meetings when appropriate (H-8160-1, 2003f:15).

Native American organizations were invited to participate at all levels of the planning process for the RMP.

On August 1, 2003, the BLM's Utah State Director, Sally Wisely, notified 35 tribal entities of the intent of the BLM's Monticello FO to prepare an RMP/EIS. Further, these tribal entities were invited to consult on the entire range of cultural and natural resource issues (Table 5.1). Between November 2002 and May 2003 all 35 tribes were contacted by SWCA ethnographer Molly Molenaar to 1) ensure that the consultation letter was received by the appropriate tribal contact, and 2) determine the need for additional or future consultation for the study areas identified in the consultation letter. As part of the scoping process, meetings with tribes were arranged when requested. During these meetings an emphasis was placed on the discussion and identification of historic properties having cultural significance to tribes (commonly referred to as traditional cultural properties [TCPs]), pursuant to the consultation requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Likewise, in furtherance of the EIS scoping process and the NHPA consultation requirements, the Monticello FO participated in 12 meetings with tribal entities and no Traditional Cultural Properties were identified (Table 5.2). However, potential TCPs were identified during a records review and discussed in the AMS submitted in 2004. An ethnographic overview that is being prepared concurrently with the EIS that will also discuss potential TCPs associated with local tribes.

Tribes contacted had a range of requests and comments that are listed in Section 5.2.1.1 of this chapter. Consultation with interested tribes is ongoing. The Monticello FO mailed a draft copy of the range of alternatives to 12 tribes in December 2005. Meetings will be held with those tribes requesting to consult with the BLM on the draft alternatives.

Table 5.1. Tribes Contacted by the BLM, Utah State Director

Navajo Nation	Hopi Tribe
Navajo Utah Commission	Navajo Nation, Aneth Chapter
Navajo Nation, Dennehotso Chapter	Navajo Nation, Mexican Water Chapter
Navajo Nation, Navajo Mountain Chapter	Navajo Nation, Oljato Chapter
Navajo Nation, Red Mesa Chapter	Navajo Nation, Teec Nos Pos Chapter
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	White Mesa Ute Council
Southern Ute Tribe	Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe	Pueblo of Santa Clara
Pueblo of Zia	Pueblo of Zuni
Pueblo of Laguna	Eastern Shoshone Tribe
Pueblo of Taos	Kaibab Paiute Tribe
San Juan Southern Paiute Council	Pueblo of Acoma
Pueblo of Cochiti	Pueblo of Isleta
Pueblo of Jemez	Pueblo of Laguna
Pueblo of Nambe	Pueblo of Picuris
Pueblo of Pojoaque	Pueblo of Sandia
Pueblo of Santa Ana	Pueblo of Tesuque
Pueblo of Santo Domingo	

Table 5.2. Meetings with Tribes

Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Office	Hopi Cultural Preservation Office
Navajo Utah Commission	Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Council
Navajo Nation, Dennehotso Chapter	Pueblo of Santa Clara
Pueblo of Zia	Pueblo of Zuni
Pueblo of Laguna, NAGPRA Committee	

5.2.1.1 TRIBAL CONCERNS, COMMENTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Below is a summary of the tribal consultation and coordination meetings held during the RMP planning process. Only comments concerning actions in the Monticello FO are included below. Where appropriate, tribal concerns have been incorporated into the BLM's land management decision-making process.

5.2.1.1.1 NAVAJO

As part of the scoping process and pursuant to NHPA's consultation requirements, the Moab and Monticello FOs jointly met with the Navajo Nation and the Navajo Utah Commission in 2003.

BLM, Moab and Monticello FOs met with the Navajo Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office and Navajo Utah Commission at their monthly meeting in Dennehotso. The Monticello FO also

met with the Navajo Nation Chapter Houses of the Dennehotso, Oljato, Red Mesa, Mexican Water, Navajo Mountain, Teec Nos Pos, and Aneth in 2004 and 2005.

5.2.1.1.1 Navajo Nation

Meeting held on December 9, 2003

The following requests were made and concerns were voiced:

- A concern was raised for continued consultation regarding minerals on the McCracken Extension and a claim was made for Navajo limestone on Lime Ridge.
- Concern for wildlife along the San Juan River and recreational use of the San Juan River was voiced. The need for permits from the Navajo Nation for hiking and camping on the Navajo side of the San Juan River has been discussed in the past with the Monticello FO, but there has been no action on this issue. There is a willingness on the part of the Navajo Historic Preservation Division to set up meetings with river guides, BLM employees, or any other groups to explain the Navajo view. This cultural sensitivity training can be provided by the Tribe for the cost of the lodging of the instructors.
- Wild and Scenic river determinations on the San Juan River were discussed. (This is underway and there has been consultation with the Tribe.)
- The Navajo Nation would like to see language in the RMP/EIS that the BLM would notify the Navajo Nation chapters of the availability of firewood.
- Adequate consultation with the Chapters on a variety of issues including wilderness and cultural resource management needs to take place. The Navajo understand the relationship between the major cultural attractions in the Four Corners and the economy of this area. It is understood that when tourists come to these attractions they visit adjacent areas and have a significant economic impact. For the Navajo tribe, the key to this interaction is the sensitivity visitors have when visiting cultural sites.
- The Navajo Nation takes the position that there are opportunities for co-management of some BLM lands, the San Juan River, for example. The Nation would like to see Co-management, as a management strategy, discussed in the RMP/EIS.
- The Navajo Nation would like to see flexibility in how the RMP/EIS is interpreted, as appropriate.
- The Navajo Nation is interested in the type and quantity of archaeological records the BLM is using in the RMP/EIS process.

5.2.1.1.2 Navajo Utah Commission

Meeting held on February 11, 2004

The Navajo Commission stated the following:

- Medicine men need to have access to BLM lands.
- BLM needs to consult with all Navajo Chapters in Utah concerning the RMP EIS.

5.2.1.1.1.3 Aneth Chapter of the Navajo Nation

Meeting Held on February 6, 2005

- Navajo should be informed when areas are given a restricted access status. Aneth members pick sumac berries and use the sumac plant to make baskets. Access to sumac picking locations has recently been denied. Access to pinyon locations has also been restricted. If companies are being allowed access to the pinyon trees for profit, the Navajo should have the same access rights.
- Navajo support WSAs especially in the protection of traditional medicinal herbs and cultural resources.
- Aneth wants to be a cooperating agency for the RMP.

5.2.1.1.1.4 Dennehotso Chapter of the Navajo Nation

Meeting held on February 13, 2004

- Existing access roads should be kept in place. Please inform the Navajo Nation and Chapters Offices in Utah when road closures are being considered. Plant and mineral resources are collected by Navajo medicine men in various areas with the BLM FO areas. They need to have access to their gathering areas. Existing roads often provide the best access to gathering areas.
- A concern was voiced about the die off of plants in existing plant gathering areas. The BLM should inform the Navajo Nation when plants in the FO areas are dying off in certain locations.

5.2.1.1.1.5 Mexican Water Chapter of the Navajo Nation

Meeting held on November 14, 2004

Mexican Water Chapter officials are in contact with the Monticello FO concerning the RMP. To date, specific comments have not been submitted to the Monticello FO.

5.2.1.1.1.6 Navajo Mountain Chapter of the Navajo Nation

Meeting held on September 26, 2004

- The wood hauling permitting process is not convenient. Traditional Medicine Men gather herbs on Bear's Ears and are told to pay for gathering herbs. This is not right! There is also a problem with woodcutting access to certain areas. Sometimes tribal members are told that they cannot access certain areas for woodcutting. The Navajo Nation and individual Chapters need to work with the BLM to solve this problem. The Medicine Men should be able to purchase a permit at the Chapter center, not have to drive to Monticello to buy the permit.
- Native Americans are not given the opportunity to raise cattle on public lands in Utah. They are shut out by preference toward other ranchers. The Navajo Mountain Chapter would like to learn more about grazing permits on public lands.
- The policies concerning traditional hunting practices in Utah are based on Anglo values-the Navajos have traditional hunting practices that are denied. The Navajo have a history of hunting in areas north of the San Juan River. These locations should be considered as traditional use areas.

- The BLM should consider ways to eradicate salt cedar and other exotic plants that are creeping into the canyons. The Navajo Nation wants to consult with land managing agencies about this problem.

5.2.1.1.1.7 Oljato Chapter of the Navajo Nation

Meeting held on March 13, 2005

- The Navajo use public lands for herb and fire wood collection and want to access and use the land and resources like they used them in the past to gather resources for various cultural practices.
- Oljato Chapter officials requested to be involved in the planning process.
- Oljato Chapter members would like a more convenient way to apply for a woodcutting permit. They currently have to drive to Monticello to get the permit.
- Oljato members have traditional names of mountains and other significant places and want to share this information with the BLM.

5.2.1.1.1.8 Red Mesa Chapter of the Navajo Nation

Meeting held on January 10, 2005

- Red Mesa Chapter officials are concerned with unregulated and unchecked OHV use in restricted areas, especially in Cedar Mesa, a sacred area to the Navajo.
- The BLM should consult with the Red Mesa Chapter on locations selected for chaining to remove existing vegetation.

5.2.1.1.1.9 Teec Nos Pos Chapter of the Navajo Nation

Meeting held on April 10, 2005

Navajo have grazing permits in areas along the San Juan River where fences have been erected to protect big horn sheep habitat. Teec Nos Pos Chapter does not want the fencing in their grazing areas.

5.2.1.1.2 UTE

As part of the scoping process and in furtherance of the NHPA's consultation requirements, the BLM Monticello and Moab FOs jointly met with the Ute Mountain Ute Tribal Council.

5.2.1.1.2.1 Ute Mountain Ute Tribe

Meeting held on August 26, 2004

The tribe represented the following concerns:

- The proposed RMP/EIS is a political document rather than a management document. Additional meetings may be required to discuss specific resource issues.
- The tribe expressed its concern that historic district designations and legislation regarding water quality, clean air, and wilderness designations eventually prevent people from using the lands. This does not always benefit the tribe. For example, areas with special designations can have too many restrictions on grazing permits. A request was made for maps that identify WSAs.

- Carl Knight was identified as a future contact for the tribe if additional meetings are required.
- Concern was expressed about "people from the East" (i.e., the U.S. Congress) often commenting on these types of plans and decisions based on their own outside agendas. How much authority does the BLM really have over this plan? If the BLM does not have the authority to consult, then the meeting should not be considered government-to-government consultation. The tribe requested a copy of the BLM tribal consultation policy, which was provided at a later date.

5.2.1.1.3 PUEBLOS

Representatives from the Moab and Monticello FOs participated in a meeting with the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office in December, 2003 as part of the scoping process in furtherance of NHPA's consultation requirements. The Moab FO manager and archaeologist represented both FOs during meetings with the Pueblos of Zuni, Laguna, Zia, and Santa Clara.

5.2.1.1.3.1 Hopi Tribe

Meeting held on December 17, 2003

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office is interested in the Monticello management plans because of the large number of archaeological sites in the FO areas. It is unlikely, however, that the Tribe will request cooperating agency status for the plans.

The overriding issue that the Hopi Tribe has with the BLM is the reburial policy (Instructional Memorandum 98-131-2) which prohibits reburial of human remains (subject to NAGPRA) on BLM lands. The tribe is currently seeking "protection and perpetuity" for burials and reburials on BLM lands. If the policy is revoked, reburial locations will have to be chosen on public lands. ACECs and Puebloan ancestral sites could be considered for reburial locations. Other ideas discussed during the meeting were the development of a cemetery on public lands or the use of an environmental non-development zone like Grand Gulch; however, the preference is to have a reburial location that does not attract visitors. [Note: Since this consultation, BLM Instructional Memorandum 2007-002 outlined updated guidance that allows for NAGPRA materials encountered during the course of disturbance activities to be reburied as close as possible to the site, rather than being excavated. However, current guidance does not address the reburial location for the large number of NAGPRA materials housed in BLM museum collections.]

The tribe will request field visits to the Monticello FO to determine the presence or absence of Hopi TCPs in the project areas

The Tribe voiced a concern about the segmentation of federal actions. It is difficult to protect TCPs when drill pad applications are each considered as a separate application, even though the same company files dozens of applications at once. The Hopi do not like to see impacts assessed in this manner. The BLM must see the connected action during the environmental review.

The Tribe requested an ethnographic study that would include interviews with elders.

The Hopi have a cultural interest in the Colorado River but did not give any specific information during the meeting.

The Tribe requested that BLM protect areas with great site density within the Monticello FO.

5.2.1.1.3.2 Pueblo of ZuniMeeting held on March 3, 2004

Zuni would like to develop an access agreement with the Monticello FO that would allow them to access resource gathering areas without having to go through a permit process. The development of an MOU was proposed.

A request was made for a list of plant and mineral resources on BLM lands.

The Zuni requested agreements between with the National Park Service and BLM that would allow Zuni elders to collect birds and feathers and to hunt birds on federal lands. It was reported that the rivers and associated bird habitats on Zuni tribal lands have dried up and as a result the elders have had a difficult time hunting birds and collecting feathers.

The Zuni Council would like to consult on fire management.

Zuni members would like to hunt for copper on BLM lands.

5.2.1.1.3.3 Pueblo of LagunaMeeting held on March 3, 2004

The following comments were raised:

- Douglas fir and willows are culturally significant resources currently being used in ceremonies. Moab and Monticello FOs both have stands of fir and willow.
- The Laguna requested a field visit. Laguna is particularly interested in seeing rock art sites.
- The Laguna requested additional documentation on cultural resources.

5.2.1.1.3.4 Pueblo of ZiaMeeting held on March 3, 2004

The following comments were raised:

- The Zia requested to collect a few sacks of copper-bearing rocks.
- Research should not be conducted at burial sites. If human remains are found, Zia's position is that human remains should be reburied as close to their original burial location as possible.
- Concerns were raised for protection of rock art, but no specific requests were made. Governor Pino is in favor of any restoration programs that would reduce pot hunting and vandalism.
- BLM's reburial policy should be revoked and Zia can provide individuals to testify against this policy. [Note: Since this consultation, BLM Instructional Memorandum 2007-002 outlined updated guidance that allows for NAGPRA materials encountered during the course of disturbance activities to be reburied as close as possible to the site, rather than being excavated. However, current guidance does not address the reburial location for the large number of NAGPRA materials housed in BLM museum collections.]
- Burials should not be used for research studies.
- The Zia requested a copy of the National Policy for Land Exchange.
- The Zia requested additional cultural information on the Fremont culture.

5.2.1.1.3.5 Santa Clara

Meeting held on March 2, 2004

According to their histories, Santa Clara elders went as far as Utah for trading, hunting; there may be significant sites and artifacts, but the locations of these sites and artifacts are unknown. A field visit was requested.

Santa Clara does not feel that the repatriation of human remains should be carried out. Burials should not be moved once they are discovered.

Archaeological sites should not be flagged. This draws attention to sites.

Santa Clara would like to be notified about project treatment plans when they include archaeologically sensitive locations within a project area. There is rarely any follow-up or notice of project completion sent to consulting tribes. This needs to be corrected for future projects.

Would the BLM consider organizing a committee for human remain discoveries that would include tribal representatives?

A concern was voiced for the protection of TCPs, especially from recreationists, but no specific requests were made.

A request was made for a copy of the meeting notes.

5.2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA)

The Environmental Protection Agency's air quality protocols are used as guideline standards for this document.

5.2.3 U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The actions proposed in this document require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). These actions have met any consultation/coordination requirements that may exist pursuant to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

The BLM and the USFWS are continuing close coordination for Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance of all aspects of the Monticello RMP/EIS.

The USFWS and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) have been consulted regarding the effects of the draft RMP/EIS on species listed pursuant to the ESA. Endangered species protections include compliance with existing ESA requirements.

In July 2004, the BLM requested assistance from the Service in identifying threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate plant and animal species that may be located in the Monticello planning area. A letter was sent by the BLM State office to the Service initiating informal consultation for the Monticello planning efforts. The Service responded in lists of species that may be present in or may be affected by projects in the subject project area. Tables 3.53 to 3.55 present a comprehensive list of sensitive species that may be present in the project area and indicates whether they could be affected by the proposed and alternative actions. The results of this consultation have been incorporated into this RMP/EIS.

5.2.4 STATE AGENCY COORDINATION

NEPA requires that the Lead Agency (BLM) must formally consult with responsible and trustee agencies in determining whether to prepare an EIS. The primary tool for this coordination is the preparation of the draft alternatives (Chapter 2) for review by state agencies, and subsequently the preparation of the draft RMP/EIS. A draft was sent to the State of Utah Department of Natural Resources on March 21, 2007 and distributed to the following agencies: The Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining; Utah Division of Wildlife Resources; Utah State Parks and Recreation; Utah Geological Survey; the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA).

5.2.5 COOPERATING AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

Cooperating agency status has been extended to federal, state, and local agencies with regard to the Monticello EIS/RMP planning effort. San Juan County signed a MOU in 2001 to be cooperating agencies. The State of Utah also signed a cooperating agency agreement in 2001. Cooperating agencies that have participated in the development of the draft EIS/RMP include: U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, State of Utah, and San Juan County.

Many meetings were held with the cooperating agencies throughout the planning process, occurring between March 2003 and March 2006. EIS/RMP-related topics discussed in these meetings included socioeconomics, Wild and Scenic River suitability, ACEC relevance and determination, travel plans, and the development of alternatives.

5.2.6 OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT/COORDINATION

In addition to the cooperating agencies, the Monticello FO has held meetings with and sought the input of other agencies that have land management jurisdiction within or adjacent to the planning area. Agencies include the U.S. National Park Service, and the U.S. Forest Service. Adjoining BLM field offices, including Durango, Montrose, and Moab, and the BLM Utah State Office also provided input.

5.2.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

To satisfy the public participation requirements of FLPMA (43 USC 1712), the FLPMA implementing regulations (43 CFR 1610.2), NEPA (42 USC 4371), and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations at 40 CFR 1501.7, the Monticello FO initiated the scoping process. This process began with the publication of the June 2004 NOI in the Federal Register. Specifically, the scoping period lasted from June 4, 2003 and ended on January 31, 2004.

5.2.7.1 SCOPING

BLM relied on various methods for the scoping process, including 6 open houses in different communities (see Table 5.3), a mobile "comment cruiser" that visited 12 locations, a website with provision for e-mailing comments, and an invitation for the public to provide written comments via letters. In its Scoping Report, completed in July 2004, The Monticello FO provided a detailed description of the scoping process, planning issues derived from the comments, and analysis of the information received. The Scoping Report is available at the Monticello FO, or online at the Monticello RMP website (www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/prog/planning.1.html/). BLM received 6,138 comment letters with

19,437 comments identified in these letters and emails. Comments from the 6 open houses totaled 1,250, and the "comment cruiser" gathered 200 comments, resulting in a grand total of 20,887 comments. It should be noted that the Scoping Report covers both the Monticello and Moab Field Offices.

Table 5.3. Open House Location and Attendance

Meeting	Location	Attendance
Green River, UT	October 14, 2003	15
Grand Junction, CO	October 15, 2003	14
Moab, UT	October 16, 2003	53
Monticello, UT	October 21, 2003	54
Blanding, UT	October 22, 2003	87
Salt Lake City, UT	November 13, 2003	96
Total		319

5.2.7.2 NATIONAL MAILING LIST

The mailing list for public scoping was developed initially from the Monticello FO mailing lists and was then supplemented throughout the planning process. Those interested in being kept up to date on the process are able to submit their home or email address either by attending a public meeting, via the project web site, or by contacting BLM staff at the Monticello FO.

5.2.7.3 WEB SITE

Information on the Monticello draft RMP/EIS can also be found at the Monticello RMP website at www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/prog/planning.1.html/. The purpose of the site is to provide the public with further opportunity to learn about the Monticello planning area, its resource issues, the project purpose and need, and the planning process. The website provides the public with access to all published bulletins and documents associated with planning process. The website was also used during the public scoping process as an avenue for the public to submit their issues and concerns.

5.2.7.4 . SOCIOECONOMIC WORKSHOPS

With the purpose of engaging in a collaborative decision-making process, the BLM held a workshop with the local government leaders, industry experts, and stakeholders from San Juan County that focused on the socioeconomic conditions of the region. This specialized group was assembled with the help of county officials for the purpose of promoting an open discussion about regional social and economic patterns. This meetings held on May 6, 2003 in Monticello, provided an opportunity for the BLM to understand existing conditions and to lay the framework for the analysis of socioeconomic impacts.

5.2.7.5 DRAFT RMP/EIS

Public participation will continue with the release of this Draft RMP/RMP. The public will be given an opportunity to review and comment on the draft plan during a specified 90-day

comment period. As with the scoping meetings held in 2003, a series of public meetings will be held to gather comments on the Draft EIS and Proposed RMP. The Final EIS will incorporate all substantive comments received during the comment period. After the Proposed RMP is issued, there is a 60-day review period for the Governor's Office, and a 30 day protest resolution period. After the release of the Final EIS, BLM will resolve protests and issue the Record of Decision.

5.3 LIST OF PREPARERS

The BLM Monticello FO RMP/EIS was written and produced by a team composed of Monticello FO specialists and specialists from SWCA Environmental Consultants, an independent, third-party consulting firm. Under the guidance and direction of the BLM, the team prepared alternatives, collected data for the analysis, assessed potential affects of the alternatives, and prepared other chapters with additional comments and critiques from the cooperating agencies.

Table 5.4. List of Preparers

Name	Position	Planning Role
BLM		
Ann Marie Aubry	Hydrologist	Water Resources
Scott Berkenfield	Recreation Lead	Recreation, Wilderness
Todd Berkenfield	Assistant Planner	Wild and Scenic Rivers, ACECs, Travel Plan, Planning
Andy Boone	GIS Specialist	GIS, Travel Plan
Jeff Brown	Petroleum Engineering Technician	Hazardous Materials
Jim Carter	Archeologist	Cultural
Brad Colin, B.S.	Recreation Specialist	Recreation
Paul Curtis, B.S.	Range Management Specialist	Soils and Water, Riparian
Maxine Deeter, B.A.	Lands and Realty Specialist	Lands and Realty, Visual Resources
Ted McDougall, B.S.	Geologist	Minerals
Katie Juenger	Fuels Specialist	Fire
Nick Sandberg, B.S.	Assistant Field Office Manager	Livestock, Soils, Riparian
Summer Schulz, M.S.	Range Management Specialist	Range, Weeds, Vegetation, Woodlands
Nancy Shearin, Ph. D.	Archeologist	Cultural, Paleontology, Native American Consulting
Rob Sweeten, B.S.	Landscape Architect	Visual Resources
Gary Torres, B.S.	Planning NEPA Lead	Field Office Planner, NEPA, Minerals
Paul Leatherbury	GIS	Mapping
Jed Carling, B.S.	Rangeland Management Specialist	Livestock Grazing
Tammy Wallace, M.A.	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife and Special Status Species

Table 5.4. List of Preparers

Name	Position	Planning Role
SWCA, Environmental Consultants		
Matt Petersen, M.S.	Principal Ecologist	NEPA Specialist/QA/QC
Deb Reber, B.S.	Natural Resource Planner	Project Manager/ QA/QC
Tonya Dombrowski, Ph.D.	Environmental Chemist	Air Quality
Sheri Ellis, M.S.	Cultural Resources Lead	Fire Management, Cultural Resources, Lands and Realty
Laura Burch Vernon M.P.A.	Environmental Planner	Socioeconomics, Hazardous Materials
Catherine Chatfield, B.A.	GIS Specialist	GIS
Jan Reed, B.A.	Ecologist	Livestock Grazing
Kristen Knippenberg, M.F.A.	Resource Specialist, Technical Editor	Minerals, editing
David Harris, M.S.	NEPA Specialist	Recreation, Travel, Visual Resource Management, Woodlands
Susan Martin, M.S.	Ecologist	Special Status Plant Species, Vegetation
Jason Green, B.S.	Environmental Planner	Recreation, Transportation
Brian Nicholson, M.S.	Ecologist	Riparian and Soils and Watershed
Mathew Seddon, Ph. D	Anthropologist	Cultural Resources
Thomas Sharp, M.S.	Ecologist	Wildlife, Special Status Species
Eric McCulley, B.S.	Geologist	Riparian, Soils/Watershed
Paul C. Murphey, Ph.D.	Principal Investigator, Paleontology	Paleontology
Greg Larson, M.S.	Resource Specialist	Fire, Lands, Soils
Elisha Wardle, B.S.	Resource Specialist	Vegetation, Special Status Species
Amanda Christensen, B.S.	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, Special Status Species
Molly Mollenaar, M.A.	Cultural Anthropologist	Native American Consultation
Dave Reinhart, B.A.	GIS Specialist	GIS Mapping
Janet Guinn, B.S.	Project Coordinator	Project Coordination, Formatting
Kari Chalker, M.A.	Technical Editor	General
Cynthia Manseau, B.A.	Technical Editor	General
John Pecorelli, B.S.	Technical Editor	General
Barb Bittner, B.A.	Technical Editor	General
Barb Bannon, B.A.	Technical Editor	General
Jean Ballagh, B.A.	Technical Editor	General
Russ Gatlin, B.A.	Technical Editor	General

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK