

1 entities, five state agencies, and six Tribes, are listed in Table 5.1-1, along with descriptions of
2 their participation.

3
4 All Cooperating Agencies have had the opportunity to participate in regular meetings and
5 workshops and webinars related to the development of this DEIS, participate in monthly
6 meetings with the joint leads, and review and comment on the DEIS. Beginning in
7 February 2012, the Cooperating Agencies met every month during the preparation of the DEIS.
8 In addition, more than 30 meetings, workshops, and webinars were conducted with stakeholders
9 and Cooperating Agencies to assist in the development of alternatives and performance
10 measures, conduct the Structured Decision Analysis (SDA), and provide general status updates.
11 Federal Cooperating Agencies (i.e., Bureau of Indian Affairs [BIA], U.S. Fish and Wildlife
12 Service [FWS], and Western Area Power Administration [Western]) also participated in the
13 process of alternative development for the DEIS.

14 15 16 **5.1.3 American Indian Tribes**

17
18 As part of the government's Treaty and Trust responsibilities, the Federal Government
19 works on a government-to-government basis with American Indian Tribes. The government-to-
20 government relationship and the process for developing open and transparent communication,
21 effective collaboration, and informed federal decision-making with Indian Tribes was identified
22 in Executive Order (E.O.) 13175, "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal
23 Governments" (U.S. President 2000); E.O. 13007, "Indian Sacred Sites" (U.S. President 1996);
24 Secretarial Order (S.O.) 3206, "American Indian Tribal Rights, Federal-Tribal Trust
25 Responsibilities, and the Endangered Species Act" (DOI 1997); S.O. 3317, "Department of the
26 Interior Policy on Consultation with Indian Tribes" (DOI 2011a); and the President's
27 "Memorandum on Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal
28 Governments" (U.S. President 1994a). In addition, Section 106 of the National Historic
29 Preservation Act (NHPA) requires federal agencies to consult with Indian Tribes on undertakings
30 on Tribal lands and on historic properties of significance to the Tribes that may be affected by an
31 undertaking (36 CFR 800.2 (c)(2)). Both Reclamation and NPS coordinate and consult with all
32 Tribal governments, Native American communities and organizations, and Tribal individuals
33 whose interests might be directly and substantially affected by activities within their jurisdiction.

34
35 Government-to-government consultation has been and will continue to be conducted
36 throughout development of this DEIS, in accordance with provisions of the Executive Orders and
37 Secretarial Orders listed above as well as Section 106 of the NHPA, and any additional
38 applicable natural and cultural resource laws (e.g., NEPA, the Endangered Species Act [ESA],
39 NHPA, and Migratory Bird Treaty Act), as well as agency-specific guidance, such as:

- 40
41 • DOI, Departmental Manual, *Departmental Responsibilities for Indian Trust*
42 *Resources*, 512 DM 2 (1995).
- 43
44 • DOI, Departmental Manual, *Departmental Responsibilities for Protecting/*
45 *Accommodating Access to Indian Sacred Sites*, 512 DM 3 (1998).

1 **TABLE 5.1-1 Summary of Cooperating Agency Involvement**

Cooperating Agency	Type	Summary of Involvement
Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)	State	AZGFD is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its role in conserving, enhancing, and restoring Arizona’s diverse wildlife resources and habitats. AZGFD is also a member of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Working Group (AMWG). AZGFD participated in several stakeholder meetings, and representatives offered expertise during development of resource goals, performance metrics, and the aquatic modeling approach.
Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)	Federal	BIA is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its administration of federal trust responsibility to Indian Tribes. BIA assisted in government-to-government consultations and served in an advisory capacity to Reclamation and the Indian Tribes.
Colorado River Board of California (CRBC)	State	CRBC is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its responsibility for maintaining or increasing the quantity of California's Colorado River water resources. CRBC is also a member of the Glen Canyon Dam AMWG and represents California as part of the group of seven Basin States that have interests in the Colorado River. CRBC contributed to the development of the Resource Targeted Condition Dependent Alternative, which served as the basis of Alternative E, and, as part of the Basin States group, provided comments on performance metrics and modeling results.
Colorado River Commission of Nevada (CRCN)	State	CRCN is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its responsibility for acquiring and managing water and hydropower resources from the Colorado River. CRCN is also a member of the Glen Canyon Dam AMWG and represents Nevada as part of the group of seven Basin States that have interests in the Colorado River. CRCN contributed to the development of the Resource Targeted Condition Dependent Alternative, which served as the basis of Alternative E, and, as part of the Basin States group, provided comments on performance metrics and modeling results.
The Havasupai Tribe	Tribe	The Havasupai Tribe is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its relationship with the Colorado River and the Canyons. The Tribe has interests in aspects of the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and Colorado River resources below the dam. Havasupai representatives have participated in Cooperating Agency meetings and meetings and webinars pertaining to Tribal values, and have contributed written portions to the DEIS.
The Hopi Tribe	Tribe	The Hopi Tribe is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its relationship with the Colorado River and the Canyons. The Tribe has interests in aspects of the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and Colorado River resources below the dam. The Tribe is also a member of the Glen Canyon Dam AMWG and Technical Work Group (TWG). Hopi representatives have participated in Cooperating Agency meetings and meetings and webinars pertaining to Tribal values, provided comments on performance metrics and resource goals, and have contributed written portions to the DEIS.

2

TABLE 5.1-1 (Cont.)

Cooperating Agency	Type	Summary of Involvement
The Hualapai Tribe	Tribe	The Hualapai Tribe is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its relationship with the Colorado River and the Canyons. The Tribe has interests in aspects of the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and Colorado River resources below the dam. The Tribe is also a member of the Glen Canyon Dam AMWG and TWG. Hualapai representatives have participated in Cooperating Agency meetings and meetings and webinars pertaining to Tribal values, provided comments on performance metrics and resource goals, and have contributed written portions to the DEIS.
The Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians	Tribe	The Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its relationship with the Colorado River and the Canyons. The Tribe has interests in aspects of the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and Colorado River resources below the dam. The Tribe is also a member of the Glen Canyon Dam AMWG and TWG. Kaibab representatives have participated in Cooperating Agency meetings and meetings and webinars pertaining to Tribal values and provided comments on performance metrics and resource goals.
The Navajo Nation	Tribe	The Navajo Nation is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its relationship with the Colorado River and the Canyons. The Tribe has interests in aspects of the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and Colorado River resources below the dam. The Tribe is also a member of the Glen Canyon Dam AMWG and TWG. Navajo representatives have participated in Cooperating Agency meetings and meetings and webinars pertaining to Tribal values, and provided comments on performance metrics and resource goals.
The Pueblo of Zuni	Tribe	The Pueblo of Zuni is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its relationship with the Colorado River and the Canyons. The Tribe has interests in aspects of the operation of Glen Canyon Dam and Colorado River resources below the dam. Zuni representatives have participated in Cooperating Agency meetings and meetings and webinars pertaining to Tribal values, provided comments on performance metrics and resource goals, and have contributed written portions to the DEIS.
Salt River Project (SRP)	Public Utility	SRP is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its role as one of the primary public utility companies in Arizona. SRP participated in several Cooperating Agency and stakeholder meetings and provided comments on performance metrics and modeling results.
Upper Colorado River Commission (UCRC)	Inter-State	UCRC is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its role as part of the group of seven Basin States that have interests in the Colorado River. UCRC is also a Glen Canyon Dam AMWG member. UCRC contributed to the development of the Resource Targeted Condition Dependent Alternative, which served as the basis of Alternative E, and, as part of the Basin States group, provided comments on performance metrics and modeling results.

TABLE 5.1-1 (Cont.)

Cooperating Agency	Type	Summary of Involvement
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)	Federal	The FWS is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its jurisdiction by law and special expertise with respect to the ESA and biological resources within the study area. FWS has participated in the formation and development of LTEMP resource goals and objectives, performance metrics and alternatives, as well as the development of the aquatic modeling approach. In addition, a representative from FWS serves as the Tribal Liaison and has participated in government-to-government meetings with the Tribes.
Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems (UAMPS)	Public Utility	UAMPS is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its role as a purchaser of electricity from the Colorado River Storage Project. UAMPS is also a member of the AMWG. UAMPS participated in Cooperating Agency and stakeholder meetings and provided comments on the performance metrics.
Western Area Power Administration (Western)	Federal	Western is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its role in marketing and transmitting electricity from the Glen Canyon Dam. Western representatives participated in the development of alternatives and hydropower performance metrics and provided funds for the hydropower systems analysis.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

- DOI, Order No. 3317, *Policy on Consultation with Indian Tribes*, December 1, 2011 (DOI 2011a).
- Reclamation, *Indian Policy of the Bureau of Reclamation*, 1998 (revised 2001).
- Reclamation, *Protocol Guidelines, Consulting with Indian Tribal Governments*, 2001 (Reclamation 2012g).
- *Programmatic Agreement among the Bureau of Reclamation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the National Park Service, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, Havasupai Tribe, Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Kaibab Paiute Tribe, Navajo Nation, San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, Shivwits Paiute Tribe, and Zuni Pueblo Regarding the Operation of Glen Canyon Dam*, 1994 (Reclamation 1994).
- NPS, *Management Policies 2006* (NPS 2006d).

On November 30, 2011, 43 Tribes, bands, and organizations were formally invited to enter into government-to-government consultation on the LTEMP DEIS. The letters, sent by the joint-lead agencies, provided notification of the intent to prepare the LTEMP DEIS; initiated government-to-government consultation; and invited the Tribes to identify concerns related to

1 historic properties, including traditional cultural properties and archaeological sites, natural
2 resources, relevant Indian Trust assets, and other issues of importance.

3
4 A total of 31 Tribes responded to the invitation. Six Tribes agreed to participate as
5 Cooperating Agencies (see Section 5.1.2); three Tribes (the Fort Mojave Tribal Council, Pueblo
6 of Zia, and Gila River Indian Community) agreed to participate as Consulting Tribes; eight
7 Tribes (Pueblo of Santa Clara, Ute Indian Tribe, Ute Mountain Ute, Pueblo of Nambe, Yavapai
8 Apache, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, the Pueblo of Santa Ana, and the Fort Yuma Quechan)
9 declined participation, but asked to remain on the mailing list; and 14 Tribes (Ak Chin Indian
10 Community, Cocopah Indian Tribe, Fort McDowell Yavapai Tribal Council, Jicarilla Apache
11 Nation, Ohkay Owingeh, Southern Ute Tribal Council, the Pueblo of Acoma, the Pueblo of
12 Laguna, the Pueblo of Sandia, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, Chemehuevi Tribal Council,
13 Tohono O’odham Nation, the Pueblo of Pojoaque, and the White Mountain Apache) declined
14 participation in the LTEMP DEIS. The joint leads have yet to receive a response to the request
15 for consultation from the remaining 12 Tribes (Colorado River Indian Tribes, Las Vegas Tribe of
16 Paiute Indians, Moapa Band of Paiute Indians, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community,
17 San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo
18 of Cochiti, the Pueblo of Jemez, the Pueblo of San Felipe, the Pueblo of Tesuque, and
19 Tonto Apache).

20
21 Cooperating and consulting Tribes were invited to attend meetings, workshops, and
22 webinars, and to review various documents related to the development of the LTEMP DEIS. A
23 series of workshops, conference calls, and webinars were held with Tribes to identify Tribal
24 resource goals and ways to measure the relative performance of alternatives against those goals.
25 A list of major face-to-face meetings, webinars, and conference calls involving Tribes is
26 provided in Appendix N, Table N-2. Meeting notes and other important documents related to the
27 LTEMP DEIS development process were sent to those Tribes who wished to remain on the
28 mailing list. Reclamation and NPS will continue to provide consultation opportunities for
29 interested Tribes and keep all Tribal entities informed about the NEPA process for the DEIS. A
30 full summary of Tribal communication as of March 2015 is provided in Appendix M.

31 32 33 **5.1.4 Other Consultations**

34 35 36 **5.1.4.1 National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)**

37
38 Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulations,
39 requires federal agencies to address the effect of projects on historical properties (i.e., resources
40 determined eligible or listed on the *National Register of Historic Places* [NRHP]) and to give the
41 State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
42 (ACHP), and Traditionally Associated American Indian Tribes, as necessary, a reasonable
43 opportunity to comment on such effects. Reclamation has the lead for Section 106 compliance
44 and initiated the process of consultation with the Arizona SHPO. Consultations regarding
45 eligibility of cultural resources to the NRHP and the effect of the proposed federal action are
46 ongoing. In addition, consultations occurred with Tribal Historic Preservation Officers and

1 Indian Tribes with concerns under E.O. 13007, “Indian Sacred Sites” (U.S. President 1996), the
2 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and Section 106 of the NHPA.

3
4 On November 30, 2011, 43 Tribes, bands, and organizations were formally invited to
5 enter into government-to-government consultation on the LTEMP DEIS (see Section 5.1.3). As
6 part of the consultation process for this DEIS, Reclamation will continue to identify concerns,
7 assess the potential for cultural resources impacts, develop appropriate mitigation measures, and
8 seek concurrence with the determination of effect. If adverse effects are identified, Reclamation
9 would continue consultation to seek options to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effects
10 on historic properties. Reclamation, in consultation with interested parties, is developing a
11 Programmatic Agreement to address any cultural resource effects and mitigation measures.

12 13 14 **5.1.4.2 State and Local Water and Power Agency Coordination**

15
16 Reclamation and NPS have had various discussions with state and local water agencies
17 regarding the proposed federal action. The seven Basin States in particular have been
18 continuously engaged throughout the scoping and alternatives development processes. This
19 engagement has consisted of conference calls, webinars, and face-to-face meetings to discuss
20 process, resource goals, alternative characteristics, metrics to determine the relative performance
21 of alternatives against those metrics, and the overall modeling approach used to quantify
22 impacts.

23
24 One of the alternatives considered in the LTEMP DEIS (Alternative E) was developed by
25 the Basin States (as the Resource-Targeted Condition-Dependent Alternative) and submitted to
26 the joint-lead agencies. The joint-lead agencies shared initial impact analysis results and insights
27 that were ultimately used by the Basin States to further refine Alternative E.

28
29 The Colorado River Energy Distributors Association (CREDA) is an organization that
30 represents consumer-owned electric systems that purchase federal hydropower and resources of
31 the Colorado River Storage Project. While not a Cooperating Agency, CREDA, a member of the
32 Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG), submitted Alternative B, and
33 Reclamation and NPS worked closely with CREDA to define and model resource effects of this
34 alternative. CREDA has also participated in stakeholder meetings and provided comments on the
35 performance metrics.

36 37 38 **5.1.4.3 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)**

39
40 FWS participated in the formation and development of LTEMP alternatives, providing
41 expertise in several workshops and webinars. FWS also worked with the joint-lead agencies and
42 subject matter expert groups in the development of resource goals and objectives and
43 performance metrics to evaluate the alternatives. FWS provided expertise during the
44 development of the aquatic modeling approach used in this DEIS.

1 Reclamation and NPS consulted with FWS on the effects of the LTEMP on species listed
2 under Section 7 of the ESA. This consultation was a continuation of ongoing consultation that
3 has occurred since 1995. Reclamation has consulted with the FWS on a total of five experimental
4 actions. The Biological Opinion prepared for the LTEMP will supersede the 2011 opinion on the
5 high-flow experimental protocol and nonnative fish protocols.
6
7

8 **5.2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

9

10 Public involvement in the NEPA process is intended to give the public the chance to
11 provide input throughout the development of a DEIS and the decision-making process for actions
12 with environmental effects. An objective of public involvement is to obtain information from the
13 public to assist the decision-maker (Secretary of the Interior) throughout the entire process,
14 culminating in a Record of Decision and eventual implementation of the selected alternative. The
15 primary goals of public involvement are:
16

- 17 1. *Credibility and transparency*: creating an open and visible decision-making
18 process for groups with divergent viewpoints.
- 19 2. *Identifying public concerns and values*: providing a mechanism by which the
20 involved agencies can understand the problems, issues, and possible solutions
21 from the perspectives of the public.
22
- 23 3. *Developing a consensus*: providing a process for reaching a consensus on
24 specific actions.
25
26

27 In order to identify issues, address public concerns, obtain public input, and keep the
28 public informed, several opportunities were provided for public participation during the
29 preparation of this DEIS. These included an early and open public scoping process and public
30 meetings related to development of preliminary alternatives. The public scoping process is
31 described below in Section 5.2.1.
32
33

34 **5.2.1 Public Scoping Process and Comments Received**

35

36 The process of soliciting input from the public is called scoping. Public scoping is a
37 phase of the NEPA analysis process and was intended to give the public the chance to comment
38 on the LTEMP, recommend alternatives, and identify and prioritize the resources and issues to
39 be considered in the DEIS analyses. Consistent with CEQ requirements (40 CFR 1501.7) and
40 DOI NEPA regulations at 43 CFR Part 46, an early and open public scoping process was carried
41 out to determine the resources or issues to be evaluated in the LTEMP DEIS, the alternatives to
42 be included in the LTEMP DEIS, and concerns or observations regarding Glen Canyon Dam
43 operations and downstream resources. Reclamation and NPS have considered the public scoping
44 comments in developing this DEIS.
45

1 Reclamation and NPS published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the LTEMP DEIS in
2 the *Federal Register* (Volume 76, page 39435) on July 6, 2011 (DOI 2011b). The NOI provided
3 initial information on the purpose and need of the LTEMP DEIS, explained the decision for
4 Reclamation and NPS to co-lead the project, and encouraged the participation of stakeholders in
5 the development of the LTEMP DEIS. The public scoping period started with the publication of
6 the NOI and ended on January 31, 2012.

7
8 Early in the scoping process, Reclamation and NPS established a website for the LTEMP
9 DEIS (<http://ltempeis.anl.gov>) that provided background information about the project,
10 information on public involvement, answers to frequently asked questions, and links to
11 documents for review. During the public scoping process, a link to the project's online comment
12 form was provided and made available on the NPS's Planning, Environment, and Comment
13 website. In addition, project updates and announcements were made available via an email
14 subscription list, press releases, and social media (e.g., Twitter and Facebook).

15
16 "A Notice to Solicit Comments and Hold Public Scoping Meetings on the Adoption of a
17 Long-Term Experimental and Management Plan for the Operation of Glen Canyon Dam" was
18 published in the *Federal Register* (Volume 76, page 64104) on October 17, 2011 (DOI 2011c),
19 which provided the date, time, and place for six public meetings to be held to solicit public input
20 on the scope of the DEIS, including potential alternatives and issues to be addressed within the
21 document. Meetings were held in the following locations:

- 22 • Phoenix, Arizona (November 7, 2011)
- 23 • Flagstaff, Arizona (November 8, 2011)
- 24 • Page, Arizona (November 9, 2011)
- 25 • Salt Lake City, Utah (November 15, 2011)
- 26 • Las Vegas, Nevada (November 16, 2011)
- 27 • Lakewood, Colorado (November 17, 2011)

28
29 The notice also indicated that there would be one web-based public meeting
30 (November 15, 2011) for those who could not attend in person. The public was also notified of
31 the meetings via a press release, local media outlets, and an op-ed article disseminated for
32 publication in local and regional newspapers.

33
34 At the public meetings, the public could view exhibits about the project, discuss issues
35 informally and ask questions of technical experts and managers. A total of 221 people attended
36 these meetings. For the web-based meeting, the public was able to listen to, via the Internet, a
37 live overview presentation of the LTEMP DEIS and to ask questions of technical experts and
38 managers.

1 A total of 447 individuals, recreational groups, environmental groups, power customers
2 or organizations, federal and state government agencies, and other organizations provided
3 scoping comments on the LTEMP DEIS. Although no formal campaign letters were received,
4 some commenters chose to incorporate in their submissions entire letters or portions of letters
5 from various other commenting organizations.
6

7 Comments received during the public scoping period covered a wide range of topics and
8 issues and represented a variety of views and interpretations. Comments addressed various
9 aspects of the proposed action, including the purpose and need (as stated in the July 6, 2011, NOI
10 [DOI 2011b]); environmental issues; dam operations and hydropower; geographic and temporal
11 scope; policy and regulatory concerns; LTEMP approach and considerations; alternatives; other
12 issues; and stakeholder involvement. A detailed summary of comments received can be found in
13 *Summary of Public Scoping Comments on the Glen Canyon Dam Long-Term Experimental and*
14 *Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement* (Argonne 2012), available on the LTEMP
15 website (<http://ltempeis.anl.gov>).
16

17 In general, the most frequent topic for comments on the LTEMP DEIS was related to
18 environmental issues. Comments and concerns frequently raised by the public included
19 restoration of the downstream Colorado River ecosystem; reestablishment of ecosystem patterns
20 and processes to their pre-dam range of natural variability; elimination or minimization of further
21 beach erosion; facilitation of sediment redeposition; in situ maintenance and preservation of the
22 integrity of cultural and archeological resources; elimination of adverse impacts on and
23 assistance in the recovery of native species; nonnative fish management; and assistance in
24 repropagation of native riparian plant communities.
25
26

27 **5.2.2 Public Meetings on Alternatives**

28

29 Members of the public were invited to participate in a 2-day open public meeting on
30 preliminary alternative concepts, hosted by Reclamation and the NPS. The meeting was held on
31 April 4 and 5, 2012, at the High Country Conference Center in Flagstaff, Arizona. More than
32 70 people attended the meeting, including members of the public, stakeholders, and project staff
33 from Reclamation, NPS, and Argonne.
34

35 During this meeting, alternatives being considered for inclusion in the LTEMP DEIS
36 were presented and discussed. Stakeholders and other attendees who had alternatives to propose
37 were able to present those ideas at the meeting; four individuals representing different
38 stakeholder groups presented their ideas. Following the presentations, meeting attendees broke
39 into smaller groups and focused on evaluating and refining the preliminary alternative concepts.
40 These small groups reported their discussions in an open forum during the meeting.
41

42 Reclamation and NPS evaluated the feedback received at this meeting and used it to
43 develop the final set of alternatives considered in this DEIS (discussed in detail in Chapter 2).
44 Maintaining that all alternatives meet the purpose and need of the proposed action, this
45 evaluation resulted in new alternative concepts, the modification of existing concepts, and the
46 combination of some concepts into single alternatives.

1 Regular updates of the LTEMP DEIS process were provided at public meetings of the
2 Glen Canyon Dam AMWG. LTEMP DEIS joint leads regularly presented the status of
3 preliminary DEIS-related materials (e.g., purpose and need, resource goals, and preliminary draft
4 alternatives) and coordination activities with the Cooperating Agencies. These meetings are
5 described in more detail in Section 5.2.3.
6
7

8 **5.2.3 Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Working Group** 9

10 The Glen Canyon Dam AMWG is a federal advisory committee. As an advisory
11 committee, the AMWG has provided a forum for discussion of key issues related to the operation
12 of Glen Canyon Dam among the federal agencies, Indian Tribes, environmental groups,
13 recreational interest groups, federal power purchase contractors, and other stakeholders who
14 have interests in the resources of the Colorado River. AMWG members meet several times
15 throughout the year to discuss competing issues on how to protect downstream resources and
16 strike a wise balance on river operations. Their recommendations are regularly provided to the
17 Secretary by the Secretary's Designee, who often brings these competing issues to a consensus
18 (Reclamation 2014d).
19

20 Separate meetings regarding the LTEMP DEIS have been held with the Glen Canyon
21 AMWG because of its status as a Federal Advisory Committee. These meetings occurred on
22 February 18–22, 2013, May 8, 2013, August 8–9, 2013, February 18–20, 2014, May 27, 2014,
23 August 27–28, 2014, February 25–26, 2015, and May 28, 2015. These meetings were conducted
24 to provide an explanation of alternatives, performance criteria, and SDA; conduct swing-
25 weighting exercises; answer budget questions; and provide general status updates.
26
27

28 **5.3 DISTRIBUTION OF THE LTEMP DEIS** 29

30 The LTEMP DEIS was mailed to Region 9 of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
31 and to each of the Governors, Senators, and Representatives from relevant Congressional
32 districts of the seven Colorado River Basin States (Arizona, California, Colorado, Utah, Nevada,
33 New Mexico, and Wyoming). An email notification of the availability of the DEIS for download
34 from the project website (www.ltempeis.gov) was sent to approximately 600 members of the
35 public who had signed up for notification during the scoping period.
36

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

This page intentionally left blank.