

## CHAPTER 5—CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) decision-making process is conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, Council on Environmental Quality regulations, and Department of the Interior (DOI) and BLM policies and procedures implementing NEPA. NEPA and the associated regulatory and policy framework require that all federal agencies involve interested groups of the public in their decision-making, consider reasonable alternatives to proposed actions, and prepare environmental documents that disclose the potential impacts of proposed actions and alternatives.

BLM holds collaborative management as a priority. Collaborative management includes what Interior Secretary Gale Norton refers to as “The Four Cs:” consultation, cooperation, and communication—all in the service of conservation. The Four Cs are the basis for this Administration's new environmentalism, one that looks to those closest to the land -- rather than to Washington, D.C., for answers to public land issues." Public involvement, consultation, and coordination have been at the heart of the planning process leading to this Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This has been accomplished through public meetings, informal meetings, individual contacts, news releases, planning bulletins, a planning Web site, and *Federal Register* notices.

### 5.2 SPECIFIC CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS

Federal laws require BLM to consult with Native Americans, 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 BLM throughout the entire process of developing the Draft RMP/EIS.

#### 5.2.1 Native American Consultation

As part of the general scoping process, letters were sent to the 37 tribes listed in Table 5-1. The letters requested information for consideration in the planning process.

**Table 5-1. Tribes Contacted for Price and Vernal Resource Management Plans**

Jicarilla Apache Tribe	Navajo Nation
Kaibab Paiute Tribe	Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
San Juan Southern Paiute	Hopi Tribe
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 San Felipe	Pueblo of San Ildefonso
Pueblo of San Juan	Pueblo of Santa Clara
Pueblo of Santa Ana	Pueblo of Santo Domingo
Pueblo of Sandia	Pueblo of Taos
Pueblo of Tesuque	Pueblo of Zia
Pueblo of Zuni	Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute Tribe
Duckwater Shoshone Tribe	Eastern Shoshone Tribe
Ely Shoshone Tribe	Confederated Tribes of Goshute Nation
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians

Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians	Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe
Southern Ute Tribe	White Mesa Ute Tribe
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	

As a result of these letters, 11 tribes requested meetings to discuss the Price RMP:

- Navajo Nation
- Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
- Pueblo of Laguna
- Pueblo of Santa Clara
- Pueblo of Zia
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians
- Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians
- Southern Ute Tribe
- Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe
- Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
- White Mesa Ute Tribe.

BLM received comments from the Ute tribe requesting that in the planning document BLM consider and protect cultural resources and sites sensitive to Native Americans.

BLM has met with various Native American tribes (Ute, Hopi, Paiute) regarding this planning effort. These meetings were directed at informing the tribes of our planning processes and soliciting information on potential issues of concern. BLM will initiate formal consultation with interested tribes upon publication of the Draft RMP/EIS.

### **5.2.2 State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)**

The Price Field Office (PFO) has been working with SHPO during the planning process. Formal consultation will be finalized before the Record of Decision is signed.

### **5.2.3 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Consultation**

The PFO worked with the USFWS for the Endangered Species Act, Section 7, Consultation. Early in the planning process, BLM developed a Regional Consultation Agreement with the USFWS that provided for the participation of the latter on BLM's interdisciplinary team. The USFWS provided input on planning issues, data collection and review, development of alternatives.

BLM will ensure that additional consultation will be initiated with the USFWS during review of the Draft RMP/EIS. BLM will meet with the USFWS to discuss a draft biological assessment of the potential for beneficial or adverse impacts on threatened and endangered species.

### **5.2.4 Environmental Protection Agency**

Coordination with the EPA through various meetings has occurred throughout the Price RMP process. EPA has also participated as a member of the Air Quality Protocol Group, which includes BLM, USFS, the State of Utah, and the National Park Service (NPS).

### 5.3 COOPERATING AGENCIES

The PFO extended cooperating agency status to the State of Utah, Carbon County, and Emery County for the Price RMP planning effort. These entities were invited to participate because they had jurisdiction by law or could offer special expertise. A list of the cooperating entities, or agencies, that have actively participated in cooperation meetings leading up to the development of the Proposed RMP/Draft EIS is included below. Coordination and consistency for this planning effort were primarily accomplished through the assistance of the cooperating agencies formally involved in the project:

- Carbon County
- Emery County
- State of Utah
- USFWS.

The cooperating agencies were formally invited to participate in the development of the alternatives and to provide existing data on their responsibilities, goals, and mandates. The PFO held meetings with the cooperating agencies from March 31 through April 4, 2003, concerning the approach to the planning process and the development of alternatives. The cooperating agencies were invited to work with the BLM interdisciplinary team in developing the alternatives.

The agencies participated in more than 20 interdisciplinary meetings throughout the planning process.

### 5.4 COORDINATION AND CONSISTENCY

Coordination with other agencies and consistency with agency and local and state government plans are accomplished through frequent communication and cooperation between BLM and the involved federal, state, and local agencies. The Utah Governor's Resource Development and Coordinating Committee (RDCC) has been involved since the inception of this planning process and is a member of the interdisciplinary team.

The Utah Governor's Office receives copies of this Draft EIS for review to ensure consistency with ongoing state plans. Table 5-2 summarizes coordination actions undertaken by various federal, state, and local agencies for the RMP development process.

**Table 5-2. Key Coordination Actions**

Agency	Coordination/Responsibility
<b>FEDERAL AGENCIES</b>	
<b>U.S. Department of the Interior</b>	
USFWS	Reviews actions affecting threatened or endangered species of fish, wildlife, or plants (Section 7 consultation, coordination, and review).
Geological Survey	Reviews Price RMP/EIS for consistency with USGS planning.
NPS	Reviews Price RMP/EIS for coordination with NPS planning.
<b>U.S. Department of Agriculture</b>	
USFS	Coordinates mineral leasing and other activities that affect lands administered by the USFS. Reviews the Price RMP/EIS for consistency with USFS planning. Coordinates and cooperates with EPA and Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) on monitoring and collection of air quality data.
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service–Wildlife Services	Coordinates annual management plan for animal damage control activities on public lands.

Agency	Coordination/Responsibility
<b>Environmental Protection Agency</b>	Coordinates with BLM, USFS, and UDEQ on monitoring and collecting air quality data. Reviews air-quality-monitoring data. Files <i>Federal Register</i> notices.
<b>STATE AGENCIES</b>	
<b>State of Utah</b>	Participates in the environmental analysis and documentation process by providing information concerning environmental issues for which the State of Utah has jurisdiction by law or special expertise. Provides information from state records on matters including, but not limited to, Price RMP/EIS project impacts on air quality and Class 1 air sheds, fish and wildlife, domestic livestock grazing, social and economic impacts, minerals, and State of Utah permitting requirements. This information includes a focus on restoration activities in which the state has identified water bodies impaired by pollutants for which BLM, through best management practices, can provide positive benefits and improvements.
Governor's Office of Planning and Budget	Provides leadership for the initiatives of the Governor, budgeting, planning, and issue coordination by providing accurate and timely data, impartial analyses, and objective recommendations.
Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Water Quality	Coordinates and cooperates on water quality, development of monitoring for visibility standards and guidelines, and collection of air quality data.
Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Oil, Gas and Mines	DOGMA issues permits to mine (and drill for oil and gas) on State, Federal and private land. These permits are obtained only after a thorough and exhaustive review of each mine plan.
School and Institutional Trust Land Administration	Manages state school and institutional trust lands.
Utah State Forestry, Emergency Management Agency, State Fire Marshal's Office	Coordinates regarding forest management of prescribed fire and wildland fire.
Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife Resources	Coordinates and cooperates on vegetation treatment projects, wildlife habitat management, big-game-herd objectives, and special status species.
Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Parks and Recreation	Administers and manages state parks.
Utah Department of Transportation	Coordinates and cooperates on transportation planning and highway access.
Utah Geological Survey	Data sharing.
State Historic Preservation Office	Consults on compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in accordance with the National Programmatic Agreement as implemented in the Utah Protocol to that agreement.
<b>COUNTY AGENCIES</b>	
<b>Carbon County Emery County</b>	Participates in environmental analysis and documentation by providing information on environmental issues for which each specified county has jurisdiction by law or special expertise. Provides information on Price RMP/EIS project impacts on domestic livestock grazing and on social and economic impacts relating to each specified county.

A consistency review of the Carbon and Emery County Master Plans was completed. With few exceptions, the preferred alternative in this Draft RMP/EIS is consistent, or partially consistent, with the Carbon and Emery County Master Plans (see Table 5-3).

**Table 5-3. Consistency Review with Carbon and Emery Counties**

<b>Consistency between Carbon and Emery County Master Plans and BLM PFO RMP/DEIS</b>			
<b>Resources</b>	<b>BLM PFO DEIS/RMP Preferred Alternative</b>	<b>Carbon County</b>	<b>Emery County</b>
Air	Consistent		
Soil and Water	Consistent		
Vegetation	Consistent, MOUs exist with counties for noxious weed control, management is consistent throughout field offices with both counties		
Cultural Resources	Consistent		
Paleontology	Consistent		
Visual Resources	Consistent		
Special-Status Species	Consistent		
Fish and Wildlife	Consistent		
Wild Horses and Burros	75-125 horses (Range Creek, Carbon County)	No more than 100 horses, 0 burros (Range Creek, Carbon County)	Not specifically addressed in Master Plan
Fire Management	Consistent		
Forestry	Develop forest and woodland management plan.	Request that BLM hire a regional forester	Not specifically addressed in Master Plan
Livestock Grazing	Manage grazing and rangeland health according to the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines. Provide for the voluntary relinquishment of grazing permit by a willing permittee	Maintain current level of [livestock] grazing No reduction of animal unit months (AUM)	County industries such as agriculture depend on continued use and availability of public land and its resources.
Recreation (off-highway-vehicle [OHV] use)	Consistent OHV use will be allowed on designated routes.	Consistent Identify appropriate routes for OHV and all-terrain-vehicle (ATV) use.	Consistent The county acknowledges that access may be restricted to designated roads.
Lands and Realty	Transfer land out of federal ownership or acquire nonfederal lands where needed to accomplish important resource management goals or to meet essential community needs. Consider land ownership changes on lands not specifically identified in the RMP for disposal or acquisition if the changes are in accordance with resource management objectives and other RMP decisions and criteria.	Carbon County encouraging no net loss of private lands. Carbon County wishes to maintain a transportation and energy corridor oriented east/west across the Green River and north/south across Nine Mile Canyon	Emery County opposes proposals advocating large-scale exchange of federal lands in Emery County for school trust lands throughout other counties unless local inputs and concerns can be resolved to the county's satisfaction.

<b>Consistency between Carbon and Emery County Master Plans and BLM PFO RMP/DEIS</b>			
<b>Resources</b>	<b>BLM PFO DEIS/RMP Preferred Alternative</b>	<b>Carbon County</b>	<b>Emery County</b>
Minerals	Balance responsible mineral resource development with the protection of other resource values and provide opportunities for mineral exploration and development under the mining and mineral leasing laws subject to legal requirements to protect other resource values. Provide mineral materials needed for community and economic purposes.	Encourage extractive industries to be in compliance with federal, state, and county laws and regulation, while protecting multiple-use concepts and rights to access. Ask that federal agencies institute a bonding requirement.	As permitting, regulatory, and management work is conducted, Emery County expects cooperation from the government and private entities involved to achieve an appropriate balance among the industry's development goals, government regulations, and the desires of Emery County to maintain its stated cultural values.
Special Designations Wilderness Study Area (WSR)	WSR – Segments of the Green River and San Rafael River (canyon) determined suitable.	WSR – support no designations (including determination of suitability).	WSR – support no designations (including determination of suitability).
SRMA/ACEC	SRMA/ACEC to provide special management of recreation and provide protection for critical resources.	Consistency with direction in FLPMA to avoid de facto wilderness.	Consistency with direction in FLPMA to avoid de facto wilderness.
WSAs	Manage WSAs in a manner that does not impair their suitability for designation as wilderness, subject to valid existing rights.	Support congressional designation of 13,000 acres of wilderness within Carbon County.	Support congressional designation of 446,000 acres of wilderness within Emery County (existing Wilderness Study Areas).

### 5.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation in the BLM planning process includes a variety of efforts to identify and address public concerns and needs. Public involvement assists the agencies in:

- Broadening the information base for decision-making
- Informing the public about the RMP/EIS and the potential impacts associated with various management decisions
- Ensuring that public needs and viewpoints are understood by BLM.

A Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the *Federal Register* on November 7, 2001, to announce formally that the BLM PFO was preparing an RMP and associated EIS. The notice invited the participation of the affected and interested agencies, organizations, and members of the general public in determining the scope and significant issues to be addressed in the planning alternatives and analyzed in the EIS.

Following the *Federal Register* publication on November 7, 2001, a number of comments were received indicating that the scoping period was too short and the geographic extent of the meeting sites was too limited. These comments were considered, and a second NOI was published on January 18, 2002, in the *Federal Register* to extend the public comment period.

Additional public involvement was solicited to help identify issues to be addressed in developing a full range of land management alternatives. This chapter describes this public involvement process as well as other key consultation and coordination activities undertaken for the preparation of a comprehensive Draft EIS for the PFO.

### 5.5.1 Scoping Period

The public is provided with a scoping period to identify potential issues and concerns associated with the RMP/EIS. Information obtained by BLM during public scoping is combined with issues identified by the agencies to form the scope of the EIS.

The NOI published on November 7, 2001, announced BLM's intention to revise the Price RMP and served as a call for resource information for the BLM PFO.

#### 5.5.1.1 Scoping Notice

The official 60-day scoping period began when a public scoping notice was prepared and mailed to federal, state, and local agencies; interest groups; and the public on November 7, 2001. A second NOI extending the comment period and adding meeting dates was published on January 18, 2002. The notices invited the public to participate in the scoping process and requested input on identifying resource issues and concerns, management alternatives, and other information valuable for the PFO in determining future land use decisions. The notice also announced the availability of the Mineral Potential Report on the Price RMP project Web site. The 100-day scoping period ran from November 7, 2001, through February 15, 2002. Included with the scoping notices was information on the PFO management area, background information on the planning process, as well as preliminary planning issues and planning criteria.

#### 5.5.1.2 Scoping Meetings

Public scoping meetings were held in five Utah communities and one Colorado community (see Table 5.4). During the six meetings, more than 270 people registered their attendance. The scoping meetings were structured in an open-house format, with BLM specialists representing issues such as livestock grazing, mineral and energy development, and other resource areas. BLM specialists were available to provide information and responses to questions. Comments from the public were collected during the meetings and throughout the scoping period through a variety of methods—mail, fax, email, and the project Web site.

**Table 5-4. Public Scoping Meetings**

Date	Location	Type
January 15, 2002	Salt Lake City, Utah	Public Scoping Meeting
January 16, 2002	Moab, Utah	Public Scoping Meeting
January 17, 2002	Grand Junction, Colorado	Public Scoping Meeting
January 29, 2002	Green River, Utah	Public Scoping Meeting
January 30, 2002	Castle Dale, Utah	Public Scoping Meeting
January 31, 2002	Price, Utah	Public Scoping Meeting

The responses received through the various methods totaled 10,300 and included 600 letters and 9,000 form letters. For the purpose of analysis, the comments were divided among 12 topic areas or categories. The category with the most comments was "Recreation/off-highway-vehicle (OHV)." These comments identified many different types of recreation activities as important to individuals and

organizations. Access for recreation activities, OHV use, and dispersed camping were central comment themes. One comment theme related to recreation was the need for vehicle access for recreation use.

The category with the second greatest number of comments was "Access/Transportation." Although fewer, comments were also received dealing with livestock grazing, wilderness and special designations, oil, gas and mining, wildlife/hunting, cultural and historic resources, air and water quality, economics, forestry, and general matters. A summary of all comments was then compiled and made available as the *Price RMP Scoping Report*, dated May 2002, which can be viewed at <http://www.pricermp.com>.

### **5.5.2 Mailing List**

The mailing list for public scoping was developed initially from the PFO mailing list and was supplemented throughout the planning process. Scoping meeting participants had the option to be added to the mailing list. In addition, individuals could add their names to the project mailing list by visiting the project Web site or by contacting BLM staff. The PFO mailing list has been used as the basis for the distribution of the Draft RMP/EIS (see Section 5.4).

### **5.5.3 Planning Bulletins**

Periodic bulletins have been developed to keep the public informed of the Price RMP/EIS planning process. The public was informed of the scoping process through the first Price RMP/EIS planning bulletin in December 2001. This bulletin provided basic background information on the project, including issues that the plan might address. The bulletin also extended an invitation for the public to get involved in the process.

The May 2002 Price RMP/EIS planning bulletin described the scoping meetings that took place in January and briefly summarized the main issues raised through public comment. This second bulletin described the process of working with cooperating agencies, alternatives development, and impact analysis, as well as future public involvement opportunities. The Price RMP project Web site was also given.

In February 2003, the third Price RMP/EIS planning bulletin was issued detailing the Wild and Scenic River process. This bulletin listed the preliminary determination of eligible rivers on lands administered by the PFO. Information from the public was solicited concerning Wild and Scenic River eligibility.

The Price River Motorized Route Inventory was discussed in the fourth Price RMP/EIS planning bulletin, of July 2003. This bulletin included a request for data to add to the accuracy of the route inventory.

### **5.5.4 Web Site**

The Price RMP/EIS project Web site can be found at <http://www.pricermp.com>. The site serves as a virtual repository for documents related to RMP development, including announcements, bulletins, and draft and final documents. These documents have been maintained in pdf format to ensure that they are available to the widest range of users. The Web site provides the public with the opportunity to submit their comments for consideration as part of scoping and to receive periodic newsletters and announcements.

### **5.5.5 Future Public Participation**

Public participation efforts will be ongoing throughout the remainder of the Price RMP planning process. One substantial part of this effort is the opportunity for members of the public to comment on the content of this Draft EIS during the specified comment period. Public meetings will also be held during this time to gather comments. The Final EIS will respond to all substantive comments received during the 90-day comment period. The Record of Decision (ROD) is issued by BLM after the release of the Final EIS, the Governor's Consistency Review, and the Protest Resolution.

## **5.6 DISTRIBUTION LIST**

### **Tribal Governments**

- Navajo Nation
- Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
- Pueblo of Laguna
- Pueblo of Santa Clara
- Pueblo of Zia
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians
- Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians
- Southern Ute Tribe
- Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe
- Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
- White Mesa Ute Tribe

### **Local Governments (Counties)**

- Carbon County
- Emery County

### **Utah State Agencies**

- Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
- School and Institutional Trust Land Administration
- Utah Department of Environmental Quality
- Utah Department of Agriculture
- Utah Department of Transportation
- Utah Department of Natural Resources
- Utah State Engineer's Office
- Utah State Historic Preservation Office
- Utah State Legislature, Government Affairs Committee

### **Members of Congress (House and Senate)**

- Senator Orrin Hatch
- Senator Robert Bennett
- Representative Jim Matheson
- Representative Rob Bishop
- Representative Chris Cannon

### **DOI (Non-BLM)**

- Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Bureau of Reclamation
- National Park Service
- Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
- Office of Surface Mining
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Geological Survey

### **Non-DOI Federal Agencies**

- Environmental Protection Agency
- Federal Highway Administration
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
- U.S. Forest Service
- Natural Resources Conservation Service
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Department of Energy