

# **CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION**



## **5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION**

---

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

During the scoping process, and consultation and coordination throughout the preparation of this EIS, formal and informal efforts were made by the OSM to involve other Federal agencies, State and local governments, tribes, and the public. Consultation and coordination with Federal and intergovernmental agencies, organizations, American Indian tribes, and interested groups and individuals are important to (1) ensure that the most appropriate data have been gathered and employed for analyses and (2) ensure that agency and public sentiment and values are considered and incorporated into decision making.

The sections of this chapter describe the consultation and coordination efforts for this EIS including the formal consultation required, public participation activities, and public review of the Draft EIS.

### **5.2 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION**

Coordination and collaboration on the EIS were accomplished through written and telephone communication, meetings, and other cooperative efforts between OSM and interested Federal, State, and local government agencies, tribes, organizations, other interest groups, and the public.

#### **5.2.1 Cooperating Agencies**

As part of scoping, Federal, State, and local agencies, and American Indian tribes that may have an interest in the Black Mesa Project EIS were invited to participate in the preparation of the EIS as cooperating agencies. A cooperating agency is any Federal, State, or local government agency or American Indian tribe that has either jurisdiction by law or special expertise regarding environmental impacts of a proposal or a reasonable alternative for a major Federal action affecting the quality of the human environment. The benefits of cooperating agency participation in the analyses for and preparation of this EIS include (1) disclosure of relevant information early in the analytical process; (2) application of available technical expertise and staff support; (3) avoidance of duplication of other Federal, State, local, and tribal procedures; and (4) establishment of a mechanism for addressing intergovernmental issues.

In August 2004, OSM sent formal letters inviting 11 agencies to participate as cooperating agencies in the preparation of the Black Mesa Project EIS and received 9 positive responses. The Arizona State Land Department and the USACE, Los Angeles District, both responded to OSM that they would participate as reviewers of the EIS rather than as cooperating agencies in the preparation of the EIS. On November 15, 2005, the Hualapai Tribe requested cooperating agency status from OSM. OSM sent a formal letter acknowledging the Hualapai Tribe as a cooperating agency on November 30, 2005. The cooperating agencies include the following:

- Federal: Department of the Interior—Reclamation, BIA, BLM; USEPA; and Department of Agriculture—Forest Service.
- American Indian Tribes: Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Navajo Nation.
- Local governments: City of Kingman, Mohave County.

The initial cooperating agencies' meeting was held on March 24, 2005 to discuss the status of the project, results of the scoping process, scope of the EIS, EIS and project schedules, future coordination, agency actions and decisions, alternatives to be considered and issues to be addressed in the EIS, and the criteria to be used to evaluate alternatives. On September 14, 2005, OSM met with the BLM in the Kingman Field Office to discuss the status of the project and, in particular, the 14-mile portion of the coal-slurry pipeline that crosses public land administered by BLM. Representatives of the Hualapai Tribe attended

the meeting. The cooperating agencies also held frequent (usually weekly) conference calls and met on May 17 and 18, 2006 to discuss the preliminary Draft EIS.

### 5.2.2 **Formal Consultation**

OSM and the cooperating agencies are required to prepare EISs in coordination with any studies or analyses required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. Sec 661 et seq. [16 U.S.C. 661]), Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. Sec 1531 et seq. [16 U.S.C. 1531]), and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. Sec 470 et seq. [16 U.S.C. 470]).

Early in the preparation of the EIS, the cooperating agencies suggested and agreed to work collaboratively in the consultations for Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Doing so would effectively facilitate the consultation processes. The following sections are summaries of the activities associated with the consultation processes to date for threatened and endangered species and cultural resources.

#### 5.2.2.1 **Biological Resources**

In accordance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq., formal consultation is required when the action agency (or agencies in this case) determines that the proposed action may affect a listed species or designated critical habitat. The consultation process determines whether the proposed action (1) is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat; (2) begins with OSM's written request and submittal of a completed biological assessment; and (3) concludes with the issuance of a biological opinion and incidental take statement from FWS.

In May 2005, URS Corporation (URS), on behalf of OSM, sent letters requesting lists of any federally listed, sensitive, endangered, and/or threatened species that may occur in the project area to the AGFD; BLM, Kingman Field Office; Forest Service, Kaibab National Forest; Hopi Tribe; Navajo Nation; Nevada National Heritage Program; FWS, Southern Nevada Field Office; and FWS, Arizona Ecological Services (a copy of the letter and list of recipients are in Appendix K). Responses and accompanying information received are summarized in Table 5-1.

**Table 5-1 Information Provided by Agency or Tribe  
Regarding Listed Species in the Project Area**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Information Provided</b>
AGFD	May 20, 2005	Special status species list
Forest Service, Kaibab National Forest	May 17, 2005	Forest Service sensitive species list
Navajo Nation	July 8, 2005	Endangered and sensitive species
Nevada National Heritage Program	July 17, 2005	Endangered, threatened, candidate and/or at risk plant and animal taxa
FWS, Southern Nevada Field Office	May 23, 2005	Federally listed species list
FWS, Arizona Ecological Services (courtesy copy to the Flagstaff field office)	July 12, 2005	Federally listed species list

Considerable efforts have been made by all participants to determine major issues and concerns and potential effects the project may have on federally listed species. At the suggestion of the cooperating agencies, a Biological Resources Subcommittee was formed soon after the cooperating agency meeting on March 24, 2005 to facilitate this process. The Biological Resources Subcommittee consists of representatives from OSM, BIA, BLM, Reclamation, USEPA, FWS, AGFD, Hopi Tribe, and Navajo Nation. The project applicants also participated in the Biological Resources Subcommittee. To date,

informal consultation has been ongoing. This process has helped (1) identify which species and habitats may be in the action area, (2) determine the effects the project action may have on listed species, (3) discuss ways the effects can be eliminated or reduced through project action modification, (4) discuss the need to enter into formal consultation, and (5) discuss ways the project action can help in the conservation of selected listed species. To date, several meetings of varied members of the Biological Resources Subcommittee have been held. Table 5-2 provides a summary of these meetings.

**Table 5-2 Summary of Meetings Related to Federally Listed Species on the Black Mesa Project**

<b>Agency/Organization</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Topics Discussed</b>
FWS, Reclamation, and URS (on behalf of OSM)	June 24, 2005	Initial organization of the Biological Resources Subcommittee.
OSM, FWS, Reclamation, BIA, AGFD, Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Peabody, SCE, BMPI, and URS	July 26, 2005	Status of the project including biological resources studies, and coordination with the participants regarding the multi-agency Consultation Agreement.
OSM, Reclamation, BIA, Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, FWS, AGFD, SCE, SRP, and URS	September 21, 2005	Results of the groundwater and streamflow modeling, and potential impacts on native fish due to baseflow reductions of water as a result of pumping water from the C aquifer.
OSM, Reclamation, BIA, Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, AGFD, SCE, Salt River Project (SRP), and URS	September 27, 2005	Initial discussion about potential conservation opportunities for threatened and endangered species that may be affected by pumping water from the C aquifer.
OSM, Reclamation, BIA, Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, SCE, SRP, and URS	September 29, 2005	Status of the species analyses, status and schedule of the Biological Assessment, and further discussion on conservation opportunities for species potentially affected by C aquifer pumping (Little Colorado River spinedace, roundtail chub, and Chiricahua leopard frog).
OSM, FWS, Reclamation, BIA, AGFD, Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, SCE, SRP, and URS	December 14, 2005	Provide background on project and potential impacts, review current list of conservation measures developed, and discuss other potential conservation measures that may be implemented to offset project related impacts to special status fish species.
OSM, FWS, Reclamation, BIA, AGFD, Forest Service, Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, SCE, SRP, and URS	January 18 and 19, 2006	Provide background on project and potential impacts, review potential conservation measures for special status fish species on the Apache-Sitgreaves and Coconino National Forests, and obtain Forest Service input on proposed conservation measures and Forest Service process for implementing these measures.
OSM, FWS, Reclamation, BIA, AGFD, Forest Service, Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, SCE, SRP, and URS	February 8, 2006	Prioritize conservation measures that have been previously identified to assist the project proponents in identifying a proposal for consideration in the Biological Assessment and EIS.
FWS, Reclamation, BIA, AGFD, SCE, SRP, and URS	February 21, 2006	Review additional information provided by meeting participants on refining the short list of potential projects ranked at the last meeting. Add as much detail as possible to the proposed projects.

Agency/Organization	Date	Topics Discussed
OSM, FWS, Reclamation, BIA, ADWR, USDI/PPA, Forest Service, Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, SCE, SRP, and URS	May 17, 2006	Review previous considerations and recommendations. Review new facts and recommendations for proposed capital conservation projects (as described in the East Clear Creek Watershed Health Improvement Environmental Assessment) to offset impacts on listed native fish species.
OSM, FWS, BIA, Navajo Nation, SRP, and URS	October 18, 2006	Review agency comments on the draft Biological Assessment.

A Consultation Agreement was developed to outline the consultation process and products, actions, and schedule for the consultation under Section 7 of the ESA. The Consultation Participants are OSM, BIA, BLM, Forest Service, USEPA, and FWS. The Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, SRP (the Mohave Generating Station co-owners were represented previously by SCE), Peabody, and BMPI are participating through BIA and OSM as applicants. OSM distributed the Consultation Agreement to the Consultation Participants for signature on November 3, 2005. All signatures were obtained by October 3, 2006.

All data collected from the Federal agencies, the tribes, and State and local government agencies, as described in Table 5-1, have been incorporated into this EIS and the Biological Assessment.

In addition to the Biological Assessment, a Biological Evaluation has been prepared and submitted to (1) the Forest Service to address Forest Service sensitive and indicator species and migratory bird species and (2) the Navajo Nation to address Navajo Nation sensitive species.

#### 5.2.2.2 Cultural Resources

Section 106 of the NHPA requires OSM and the cooperating Federal agencies to consider the effects of the agencies' undertakings on properties listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (which can include a diversity of archaeological, historical, and traditional cultural resources). Regulations for Protection of Historic Properties (36 CFR 800) implement Section 106 and define a process for Federal agencies to use in consulting SHPOs, THPOs, and other interested parties as they assess the effects of their undertakings. Pursuant to those regulations, OSM initiated Section 106 consultations with the Navajo THPO and the Arizona and Nevada SHPOs in May 2005 (a copy of the letter and list of recipients are in Appendix K). Those consultations are ongoing, and will continue during post-EIS phases of project implementation.

OSM has coordinated closely with the Hopi Tribe and Navajo Nation about various aspects of the project, including potential impacts on cultural resources. The HCPO and the Navajo Nation Archaeology Department were retained to conduct inventories of archaeological and historical sites on their respective reservations, as well as studies of traditional cultural resources of significance to their respective communities. On May 20, 2005, OSM sent letters to 11 other tribes to provide them information about the project area and to ask if they wanted to participate in the Section 106 consultations (a copy of the letter and list of recipients are in Appendix K). The Hualapai Tribe indicated they not only wanted to participate in the Section 106 consultations, but also wanted to serve as a cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS. Because of their concerns, the Hualapai Tribe Department of Cultural Resources was retained to inventory and assess effects on traditional Hualapai cultural resources. The Chemehuevi Tribe, Colorado River Indian Tribes, Havasupai Tribe, and Fort Mojave Tribe indicated they wanted to participate in the Section 106 consultations. The San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe has not decided but indicated they wanted to continue to receive information about the project. The Zuni Tribe also indicated

they wanted to continue to receive information about the project, but would defer to the Hopi Tribe and Navajo Nation regarding treatment of cultural resources and may opt to not participate in a Section 106 agreement. The Pahrump Paiute Tribe has not yet indicated if they want to participate. The Yavapai-Apache Nation, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, and Las Vegas Paiute Tribe indicated they have no concerns about the project and did not want to participate in the consultations.

Informational meetings were held on June 30, 2005 with representatives of the Navajo Nation; on July 1, 2005 with the Hopi Tribe; and on October 17, 2005 with the Hualapai Tribe to provide further information and discuss future coordination.

A Cultural Resources Subcommittee, with representatives of the lead and cooperating agencies, other involved Federal and State agencies, and project proponents was organized to coordinate compliance with Section 106, and other laws, regulations, and ordinances protecting cultural resources. The subcommittee members reviewed the cultural resources study plan and technical reports. A Cultural Resources Subcommittee meeting was held on January 10, 2006 to discuss the results of the cultural resources inventory and development of a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement.

On May 8, 2006, OSM sent a letter to the Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, and Navajo Nation requesting a government-to-government consultation meeting with each tribe. A meeting with the Hualapai Tribe was held on May 17, 2006 and with the Hopi Tribe on June 23, 2006.

### **5.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The public participation process for the EIS has been ongoing throughout the development of the EIS and will continue to the Record of Decision. In addition to formal public participation activities, informal contacts occur frequently with public land users, industry, and interested persons through meetings, field trips, telephone calls, electronic mail, and/or letters.

As required, OSM, in coordination with the cooperating agencies, conducted scoping in the early stages of preparing the EIS to encourage public participation and solicit public comments on the scope and significance of the proposed action (CEQ regulations, 40 CFR 1501.7). OSM initiated the scoping process in January 2005 by requesting comments to determine the scope of issues and concerns that need to be considered during the analyses conducted for the EIS.

#### **5.3.1 Notice of Intent**

OSM's Federal Register Notice of Intent, published on December 1, 2004 (Volume 69 Federal Register Pages 69949-69951 [69 FR 69949-69951]), marked the beginning of the scoping period for the Black Mesa Project EIS. The scoping period, required to be a minimum of 30 days, was announced as ending on January 21, 2005. OSM solicited comments from relevant agencies and the public and held eight scoping meetings in January 2005. At the request of the public, OSM extended the scoping period and held two additional scoping meetings in Forest Lake, Arizona, in February 2005. A second notice was published in the Federal Register on February 4, 2005 (70 FR 6036), announcing the additional meetings and the extension of the scoping period to March 4, 2005. Copies of the Federal Register notices are in Appendix L.

#### **5.3.2 Newspaper and Radio Announcements**

In December 2004 and February 2005, OSM issued news releases to local and regional newspapers to announce the project and to inform the public of the scoping meeting times and locations. The news releases were sent to The Navajo Times, Hopi Tutuveni, The Navajo-Hopi Observer, Arizona Daily Sun,

Gallup Independent, Mohave Valley Daily News, The Laughlin Nevada Times, Bullhead City Bee, The Kingman Daily Miner, The Winslow Mail, and Holbrook Tribune.

OSM also used paid radio announcements and newspaper advertisements to introduce the project and announce the times and locations of the scoping meetings. The radio announcements were aired in December 2004 and in January and February 2005; the newspaper advertisements were published in December 2004 and February 2005.

The paid radio announcements were aired on KUYI Hopi Radio 88.1 FM and on KTNN Radio AM 660 (Navajo Nation). The announcements on KUYI were made in Hopi followed by English twice a day on December 31, 2004, and on February 12, 14, and 16, 2005. The announcements on KTNN were made in Navajo followed by English twice a day on five consecutive days, December 29, 2004, through January 2, 2005; and on February 12, 14, and 16, 2005.

Table 5-3 lists the newspapers and the date of each paid advertisement.

**Table 5-3 Newspapers and Dates of Publications**

<b>Publication</b>	<b>Date(s)</b>
The Navajo Times	Thursday, December 16 and 23, 2004, and February 3, 2005
Hopi Tutuveni	Thursday, December 16, 2004 and Wednesday, February 2, 2005
The Navajo-Hopi Observer	Wednesday, December 15 and 22, 2004 and Thursday, February 3, 2005
Arizona Daily Sun	Wednesday, December 15 and 22, 2004
Gallup Independent	Wednesday, December 15 and 22, 2004
Mohave Valley Daily News	Wednesday, December 22 and 29, 2004
The Laughlin Nevada Times	Wednesday, December 22 and 29, 2004
Bullhead City Bee	Friday, December 24 and 31, 2004
The Kingman Daily Miner	Wednesday, December 22 and 29, 2004

### **5.3.3 Additional Public Notice**

OSM created bulletin-board flyers to announce the scoping meetings and sent the flyers to the Hopi Office of Mining and Mineral Resources and the Navajo Minerals Department with the request that the flyers be posted in public places such as tribal offices, chapter houses, and grocery stores.

In addition, OSM developed a project Web site (<http://www.wrcc.osmre.gov/WR/BlackMesaEIS.htm>) for the Black Mesa Project. Information on the Web site includes public meeting announcements; descriptions of the project, EIS planning process, and the proposed project area; Black Mesa Project Scoping Summary Report; and transcripts of the public scoping meetings.

A project newsletter update was sent in September 2005 to all members of the public who chose to be on the project mailing list as well as project team members and other interested parties. The newsletter provided a summary of the project, including the steps of the EIS process and what would be happening next in the project. In addition, a summary of issues heard during scoping was included in the newsletter. Contact information for OSM was provided to allow interested parties to ask questions or request additional information.

Two more newsletters were sent in July and September 2006. The former newsletter notified the persons on the mail list that on June 19, 2006, SCE, majority owner of Mohave Generating Station, announced it

would not continue to pursue resumed operation of the power plant. Due to uncertainty about the future of the Black Mesa Project, OSM stated that it had suspended activities to publish the Draft EIS. The latter newsletter notified persons on the mailing list that OSM had resumed work on the EIS because SRP, a minority owner of the power plant, had requested OSM to do so because it was still assessing the situation and might reopen the power plant if it found additional partners.

## 5.4 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

OSM hosted 10 public scoping meetings, with a total of more than 720 in attendance, within a period that extended from January 3, 2005, through February 19, 2005. Attendance is shown in Table 5-4.

**Table 5-4 Public Scoping Meeting Dates, Locations, Attendance, and Number of Speakers**

Meeting Date	Meeting Location	Attendance	Number of Speakers
January 3, 2005	St. Michaels, Arizona	41	9
January 4, 2005	Forest Lake, Arizona	55+	25
January 4, 2005	Kayenta, Arizona	106	22
January 5, 2005	Kykotsmovi, Arizona	119	34
January 6, 2005	Leupp, Arizona	120	29
January 12, 2005	Kingman, Arizona	35	14
January 12, 2005	Laughlin, Nevada	38	20
January 13, 2005	Flagstaff, Arizona	130+	53
February 18, 2005	Forest Lake, Arizona	44	13
February 19, 2005	Forest Lake, Arizona	38	18
TOTAL		726+	237

Each of the 10 meetings began with a presentation of the project by OSM, followed by oral presentations by members of the public wanting to comment on the Black Mesa Project and the EIS process. Two project maps and a flow chart of the EIS process were displayed at each of the meetings.

A project fact sheet, comment forms, speaker cards, and mailing list cards were made available to the public at each scoping meeting. A Navajo interpreter was available at the meetings in St. Michaels, Forest Lake, Kayenta, Kykotsmovi, Leupp, and Flagstaff to translate oral comments. A court reporter was present at each meeting and the meeting transcripts became part of the official record.

Comment forms were provided to enable individual members of the public and agency representatives to (1) express interest in being added to the project mailing list; (2) provide comments regarding issues or concerns that they deem to be significant and that they feel should be addressed in the EIS, and why; (3) provide suggestions regarding reasonable changes and/or additions to the proposed project that they feel should be made to reduce the environmental impacts (including mitigation measures not in the proposal that they feel should be carried out) and why; and (4) submit any other comments or questions regarding the overall project. OSM invited participants to submit comments in formats other than the comment forms, such as letters, facsimiles, and electronic mail messages submitted to OSM.

### 5.4.1 Comments Received During Scoping

Comments received during the scoping period were analyzed and documented in the Black Mesa Project Scoping Summary Report issued in April 2005. By the end of the scoping comment period, OSM had received 351 written or electronically mailed submissions and 237 statements made by speakers at public meetings. In addition to these, more than 2,000 form letters regarding the LOM revision were received. Specific environmental issues and where they are addressed in this Draft EIS are listed in Table 1-1.



### 5.4.2 **Review of the Draft EIS**

This Draft EIS will be distributed for review to the agencies, organizations, and individuals listed in Section 5.5. Also, to promote an understanding of the project among Hopi and Navajo native-language speakers, an audio-visual version of the Executive Summary in English, Hopi, and Navajo languages has been produced on DVD for distribution to libraries and other public offices, Hopi villages, and Navajo Chapter houses.

Comments on the Draft EIS may be submitted orally or in writing at the scheduled public meetings or in writing by letter or electronic mail to OSM (as instructed in the letter to readers at the beginning of this document). To ensure consideration in the Final EIS, all written comments must be received by the date and time announced by OSM in the Federal Register. The public meetings will be held on the Hopi, Hualapai, and Navajo Indian Reservations; in Mohave, Navajo, and Coconino Counties, Arizona; and in Clark County, Nevada. Dates and addresses of these meetings will be announced in the Federal Register, advertised in the local news media, and listed on the OSM Website: [www.wrcc.osmre.gov/WR/BlackMesaEIS.htm](http://www.wrcc.osmre.gov/WR/BlackMesaEIS.htm). During the meetings, information will be displayed to explain the environmental process and the document. Oral comments will be transcribed for consideration in the Final EIS. Native language translators will be available at meetings on the Reservations.

## 5.5 **DISTRIBUTION AND REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIS**

The following agencies, organizations, and individuals were notified that the Draft EIS will be available in paper copy, on compact disk (CD), and on the project web site. Some have requested and will receive a copy of the Draft EIS for review and comment. The Final EIS will be sent to those who request a copy or provide comments on the Draft EIS.

### ***FEDERAL***

#### ***Department of Agriculture***

Forest Service, Kaibab National Forest, Williams,  
Arizona  
Soil Conservation Service, Phoenix, Arizona

#### ***Department of the Army***

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District,  
Regulatory Branch, Arizona Section, Tucson,  
Arizona

#### ***Department of the Interior***

Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Trust Services, Washington, DC  
Navajo Regional Office, Gallup, New Mexico  
Navajo Regional Forester's Office, Ft. Defiance,  
Arizona  
Western Regional Office, Phoenix, Arizona  
Hopi Agency  
Environmental Services, Reston, Virginia  
Bureau of Land Management  
Washington, DC Office  
Arizona State Office, Phoenix, Arizona  
Kingman Field Office, Kingman, Arizona  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Washington, DC Office  
Phoenix Regional Office, Arizona  
Denver, Colorado Office  
Minerals Management Service  
National Park Service

Natural Resources Library  
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance  
Headquarters, Washington, DC  
Denver Region, Denver, Colorado  
Office of Policy Analysis, Washington, DC  
Office of the Solicitor  
Rocky Mountain Region, Lakewood, Colorado  
Office of Surface Mining  
Headquarters, Washington, DC  
Western Regional Coordinating Center, Denver,  
Colorado  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Southwest Region 2, Albuquerque, New Mexico  
Arizona Ecological Services Field Office,  
Phoenix, Arizona  
Flagstaff Sub-Office, Flagstaff, Arizona  
Division of Environmental Quality, Arlington,  
Virginia  
U.S. Geological Survey  
Flagstaff, Arizona Office  
Reston, Virginia Office

#### ***U.S. Environmental Protection Agency***

Washington, DC  
Region 9, San Francisco, California

#### ***Federal Legislators***

Senator John McCain  
Senator Jon Kyle

Congressman Richard Renzi  
Congressman Trent Franks

**STATE**

***State of Arizona***

Governor Janet Napolitano  
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality  
Arizona Economic Development Division  
Arizona Game and Fish Department  
Arizona Department of Health Services  
Arizona Department of Mines and Mineral Resources  
Arizona Department of Transportation  
Arizona Department of Water Resources  
Arizona Soil Conservation State Office  
Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer  
Arizona State Land Department  
Arizona Department of Public Safety  
Arizona State Parks

***State Legislators***

Representative Tom Boone, District 4  
Representative Jack Brown, District 5  
Representative Judy Burges, District 4  
Representative Trish Groe, District 3  
Representative Ann Kirkpatrick, District 2  
Representative Albert Tom, District 2  
Representative Bill Konopnicki, District 5  
Representative Lucy Mason, District 1  
Representative Nancy McLain, District 3  
Representative Tom O'Halleran, District 1  
Senator Albert Hale, District 2  
Senator Jake Flake, District 5  
Senator Ken Bennett, District 1  
Senator Ron Gould, District 3

***State of Nevada***

Nevada State Clearinghouse

***Tribal Governments***

The Hopi Tribe, Kykotsmovi, Arizona

Chairman, The Hopi Tribe  
Cultural Preservation Office  
Department of Natural Resources  
Environmental Protection Office  
Office of Mining and Mineral Resources  
Office of Realty Services  
Hopi Villages  
Upper Moenkopi Village  
Lower Moenkopi Village  
Village of Bacavi  
Village of Hotevilla  
Kykotsmovi Village  
Sipaulovi Village  
Mishongnovi Village  
Shungopovi Village

First Mesa Consolidated Villages

(Tewa, Walpi, Sichomovi)

Ywehloopahki (Spider Mound Village)

Outside council – Arnold and Porter, Denver,  
Colorado

The Navajo Nation, Window Rock, Arizona

President, Navajo Nation

Department of Justice

Minerals Department, Surface Mining Program

Environmental Protection Agency

Water Resources Department, Fort Defiance,  
Arizona

Navajo Chapters

Alamo Chapter

Aneth Chapter

Baca/Prewitt Chapter

Becenti Chapter

Beclabito Chapter

Birdsprings Chapter

Black Mesa Chapter

Blue Gap/Tachee Chapter

Bodaway-Gap Chapter

Breadsprings Chapter

Burnham Chapter

Cameron Chapter

Casamero Lake Chapter

Chichiltah Chapter

Chilchinbeto Chapter

Chinle Chapter

Churchrock Chapter

Coalmine Canyon Chapter

Coppermine Chapter

Cornfields Chapter

Counselor Chapter

Cove Chapter

Coyote Canyon Chapter

Crownpoint Chapter

Crystal Chapter

Dennehotso Chapter

Dilkon Chapter

Forest Lake Chapter

Fort Defiance Chapter

Gadii ahi (Cudeii) Chapter

Ganado Chapter

Greasewood Springs Chapter

Hardrock Chapter

Hogback Chapter

Houck Chapter

Huerfano Chapter

Indian Wells Chapter

Inscription House Chapter

Iyanbito Chapter

Jeddito Chapter

Kaibeto Chapter

Kayenta Chapter

Kinlichee Chapter  
 Klagetoh Chapter  
 Lake Valley Chapter  
 LeChee Chapter  
 Leupp Chapter  
 Little Water Chapter  
 Low Mountain Chapter  
 Lukachukai Chapter  
 Lupton Chapter  
 Manuelito Chapter  
 Mariano Lake Chapter  
 Mexican Springs Chapter  
 Mexican Water Chapter  
 Nageezi Chapter  
 Nahata Dzill Chapter  
 Nahodishgish Chapter  
 Naschitti Chapter  
 Navajo Mountain Chapter  
 Nazlini Chapter  
 Nenahnezad Chapter  
 Newcomb Chapter  
 Oak Springs Chapter  
 Ojo Encino Chapter  
 Oljato Chapter  
 Pinedale Chapter  
 Piñon Chapter  
 Pueblo Pintado Chapter  
 Ramah Chapter  
 Red Lake #18 Chapter  
 Red Mesa Chapter  
 Red Rock Chapter  
 Red Valley Chapter  
 Rock Point Chapter  
 Rock Springs Chapter  
 Rough Rock Chapter  
 Round Rock Chapter  
 San Juan Chapter  
 Sanostee Chapter  
 Sawmill Chapter  
 Sheepsprings Chapter  
 Shiprock Chapter  
 Shonto Chapter  
 Smith Lake Chapter  
 St. Michael Chapter  
 Standing Rock Chapter  
 Steamboat Chapter  
 Sweetwater Chapter  
 Tecnospos Chapter  
 Teesto Chapter  
 Thoreau Chapter  
 Toadlena/Two Grey Hills Chapter  
 Toh Nanees Dizi Chapter  
 Tohajiilee Chapter  
 Tohatchi Chapter  
 Tolani Lake Chapter

Tonalea Chapter  
 Torreon Chapter  
 Tsale/Wheatfields Chapter  
 Tsayatoh Chapter  
 Tselani/Cottonwood Chapter  
 Tuba City Chapter  
 Twin Lakes Chapter  
 Upper Fruitland Chapter  
 Whippoorwill Chapter  
 Whitecone Chapter  
 Whitehorse Lake Chapter  
 Whiterock Chapter  
 Wide Ruins Chapter  
 Zuni Tribe, Governor Arlen Quetawki  
 Hualapai Tribe, Peach Springs, Arizona  
 San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Pahrump Paiute Tribe, Pahrump, Nevada

#### ***Local Governments***

Clark County, Nevada, Board of Supervisors  
 Coconino County, Arizona, Board of Supervisors  
 Mohave County, Arizona, Board of Supervisors  
 Mohave County, Arizona, County Manager's Office  
 Navajo County, Arizona, Board of Supervisors  
 San Bernardino County, California, Board of  
     Supervisors  
 Yavapai County, Arizona, Board of Supervisors  
 Development and Community Services,  
     Apache County, Arizona  
 City of Bullhead City, Arizona, City Manager Tim  
     Ernster  
 City of Flagstaff, Arizona, Mayor Joseph Donaldson  
 City of Holbrook, Arizona, Mayor Brian Smithson  
 City of Kingman, Arizona, Mayor Lester Byram  
 City of Williams, Arizona, City Manager Dennis  
     Wells  
 City of Winslow, Arizona, Mayor Allen Affeldt  
 Town of Laughlin, Town Manager Jackie Brady

#### ***Project Applicants***

Peabody Western Coal Company  
 Salt River Project  
 Black Mesa Pipeline, Inc.

#### ***Private Corporations/Organizations***

Southern California Edison Company  
 Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 University of California, Berkeley, California  
 Laughlin Community College, Laughlin, Nevada  
 United Mine Workers Association, Kayenta, Arizona  
 InterTribal Council of Arizona  
 Sierra Club, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Western Navajo Farm Board, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Moyes Storey Law Offices, Phoenix, Arizona  
 Navajo-Hopi Services, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Federal Laboratory for Technology, Prescott, Arizona  
 Hopi Black Mesa Trust, Polacca, Arizona

Honor the Earth, Minneapolis, Minnesota  
 Natural Resources Defense Council, Santa Monica, California  
 Brown & Brown Law Offices, Pinetop, Arizona  
 Western States Alliance, Golden Valley, Arizona  
 Black Mesa RV Board, Leupp, Arizona  
 Utility Workers Union of America, Kingman, Arizona  
 John Franklin Squibb Enterprises, Needles, California  
 Black Mesa Water Coalition, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Coal River Mountain Watch, Whitesville, West Virginia  
 People of Black Mesa, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Black Mesa Trust, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Ethnobotanical Research Association, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Kayenta Family Health Care, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Arizona Water Group, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Southeastern Native American Alliance  
 West, Long Beach, California  
 Bluewater Network, San Francisco, California  
 Fullerton College, Whittier, California  
 Voice of the People, Hotevilla, Arizona  
 Mohave County Public Land Use Committee, Kingman, Arizona  
 ResVet' Mobile Services, Polacca, Arizona  
 Navajo Tribal Utility Authority, Fort Defiance, Arizona  
 Biome, Ecological & Wildlife Research, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 ERO Resources Corporation, Denver, Colorado  
 Intrinsic, Flagstaff, Arizona

### ***Individuals***

Adam Fromhoff, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Alexander Osif, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Allen Martin, Page, Arizona  
 Amanda Johnson, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Andrea Hartley, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Andrew Lewis, Polacca, Arizona  
 Anna Rondon, Gallup, New Mexico  
 Anne-claire Wilton, Kykotsmovi, Arizona  
 Annie Herrera, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Arnold Luna, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Ben Hoisington, Fort Defiance, Arizona  
 Betsy Mahoney, Spearfish, South Dakota  
 Beve Beath, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Billy Arizona, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Bilta Begay, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Brenna Two Bears, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Britta Jebens, Hamburg, Arizona  
 Bucky Preston, Polacca, Arizona  
 C. Jason Arnold, Kingman, Arizona  
 Calvin Kescoli, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Carl Wood, Cherry Valley, California  
 Carla Ann Jishie, Piñon, Arizona  
 Carolyn Johnson, Denver, Colorado

Charles Freteluco, Kingman, Arizona  
 Chris Bailey, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Clarissa Barnes, Dickson, Tennessee  
 Clayson Benally, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Crystal Lechino, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Dan and Lorriane Herder, Kykotsmovi, Arizona  
 Daniel Peaches, Kayenta, Arizona  
 David Yazzie, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Dawn Kish, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Debra and Richard Csenge, Topsham, Maine  
 Delores Greyeyes, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Denise Gresh, Milton, Pennsylvania  
 Dorothy and Ken Lamm, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Ed Seaton, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Elsie Benally, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Elwood Saganey, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Esther Lake, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Faith Wilcox, Westport, Maine  
 Fern Benally, Shonto, Arizona  
 Francis Billy Tsosie, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Francis Tso, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Fred Dexter, Boulder City, Nevada  
 Garret Rosenblatt, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Gary Killen, Bullhead City, Arizona  
 Gilbert Dayzie, Shiprock, New Mexico  
 Glen Manygoats, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Glenn Roehl, Bullhead City, Arizona  
 Glenna C. Begay, Forest Lake, Arizona  
 Gregory Hill, Winterhaven, California  
 Gregory Schultz, Laughlin, Nevada  
 Harry Yazzie, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Helena Begay, Forest Lake, Arizona  
 Henry Yazzie, Chinle, Arizona  
 Herb and Rose Yazzie, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Howard Todecheene, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Jacobo Marcus, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Jacobo Marcus, Kykotsmovi, Arizona  
 Janet Behrens, Laughlin, Nevada  
 Jeanette Chee, Leupp, Arizona  
 Jeremiah Kerley, Cameron, Arizona  
 Jesse Lewis, Laughlin, Nevada  
 Jessica Fisher, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Jim Panik, Laughlin, Nevada  
 Jim Schlenvogt, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Jim Thompson, Kingman, Arizona  
 Joanne Finch, Munds Park, Arizona  
 Joe Holgate, Shonto, Arizona  
 John Ford, Dolan Springs, Arizona  
 John Neville, Sedona, Arizona  
 Julia Bonds, Rock Creek, West Virginia  
 Karene Bennett, Sedona, Arizona  
 Kee Herbert Begay, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Kee Nez, Piñon, Arizona  
 Ken Batte, St. Michaels, Arizona  
 Kent Walker, Leupp, Arizona



Kia Mudge, Polacca, Arizona  
 Kim Dougherty, Dickson, Tennessee  
 Kimberly Horner, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Kitty Farmer, Santa Fe, New Mexico  
 Kristin Huisinga, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Larry Nockidinah, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Larry Wood, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Laura Chee, Leupp, Arizona  
 Lee Nez, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Lena Smith, Shonto, Arizona  
 Leonard Bailey, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Leonard Selestewa, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Leonard Talaswana, Second Mesa, Arizona  
 Leroy Kewanimpteur, Hotevilla, Arizona  
 Leta Tsosie Williams, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Linda Willie, Leupp, Arizona  
 Lisa Pascopella, Berkeley, California  
 Lisa Rayner, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Lorraine Flood, Leupp, Arizona  
 Lorraine Katenay, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Louis Cerny, Gaithersburg, Maryland  
 Louise McCabe, Leupp, Arizona  
 Lucinda Wilson, Window Rock, Arizona  
 Lucretia Black, Leupp, Arizona  
 Lucy Tabaha, St. Michaels, Arizona  
 Mae Pulinos, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Marie Douglas, Chino Valley, Arizona  
 Marie Justice, Page, Arizona  
 Marilyn Chischillie, Page, Arizona  
 Marilyn Michael, Phoenix, Arizona  
 Marilyn Tewa, Second Mesa, Arizona  
 Martha Young, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Marty Bronston, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Marvin Van Houten, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Mary Croft, Casa Grande, Arizona  
 Mary Helgeson, Snowflake, Arizona  
 Mike Hindriksen, Laughlin, Nevada  
 Milton and Lillie Johnson, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Milton Lake, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Mitch Smith, Fort Mohave, Arizona  
 Nicole Horseherder, Kykotsmovi, Arizona  
 Norman and Daniel Benally, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Oscar Doctor, Leupp, Arizona  
 Pam Powell, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Paul Carlson, Laughlin, Nevada  
 Paul Clark, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Paul Moss, White Bear Lake, Minnesota  
 Peter Jeschke, Montecito, California  
 Randy Livinggood, Bullhead City, Arizona  
 Raymond Yellowman, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Regina Lane, Page, Arizona  
 Renate Domnick, Hamburg, Arizona  
 Robert Begay, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Robert Paton, Piedmont, California  
 Roberta Franklin, Leupp, Arizona

Roberto Nutlouis, Piñon, Arizona  
 Robin and Frances Markham, Pleasant Hill, Tennessee  
 Roger Parrish, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Ron and Joyce Reid, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Roy Begody, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Roy Gilman, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Roy Tutt, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Salina Begay, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Sallie Loman, Laughlin, Nevada  
 Sandy Jesus, Window Rock, Arizona  
 Sarah Issac, Kykotsmovi, Arizona  
 Sarah Jane White, Shiprock, New Mexico  
 Scott Canty, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Sean Grant, Scottsdale, Arizona  
 Serena Calnimpewa, Kykotsmovi, Arizona  
 Simon Crank, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Star School, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Steve Mietz, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Tahnee Brown, Piñon, Arizona  
 Thomas and Edith Welty, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Thomas Yellowhair, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Thorson Kewenvoyouma, Tuba City, Arizona  
 Timothy Mose, Piñon, Arizona  
 Tom Deschene, Kayenta, Arizona  
 Tonya and Ray Garcia, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Vernon Masayesva, Flagstaff, Arizona  
 Vince Nelson, Mohave Valley, Arizona  
 Wahleah and Gloria Johns, Pinon, Arizona  
 Wilton Johnson, Window Rock, Arizona  
 Woody Katenay, Tuba City, Arizona

### ***Libraries***

Navajo Nation Library System  
 Gallup Public Library  
 Hopi Public Library  
 Tuba City Public Library  
 Page Public Library  
 Winslow Public Library  
 Holbrook Public Library  
 Flagstaff City-Coconino County Public Library  
 Kingman Library  
 Laughlin Library  
 Bullhead Library