

5 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

One intent of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), is to encourage the participation of federal and state agencies and affected citizens in the assessment procedure, as appropriate. Consultation, coordination, and public involvement are integral to identifying relevant issues and concerns and ensuring that these issues are addressed. For this Long-Term Experimental and Management Plan (LTEMP) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), this was accomplished primarily through public meetings and workshops, informal and formal agency meetings, webinars, individual contacts, website updates, news releases, and *Federal Register* notices.

Acting as joint-lead agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the National Park Service (NPS) have prepared this EIS in close coordination with several federal and state agencies (see Section 1.3). Development of this EIS also included input from Tribal governments, local agencies, programs, nongovernmental organizations, and the general public. This chapter summarizes the formal consultation and coordination that have occurred during the preparation of this EIS.

5.1 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

5.1.1 U.S. Department of the Interior

The U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), through Reclamation and NPS, has prepared this EIS, with assistance from Argonne National Laboratory (Argonne) and the U.S. Geological Survey (including staff from the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center, and Southwest Biological Science Center). Reclamation has the primary responsibility for operating Glen Canyon Dam. NPS has the primary responsibility for managing downstream resources and visitors for the Grand Canyon National Park, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and Lake Mead National Recreation Area. As joint leads, both agencies have been equally involved in all aspects of the development of the LTEMP and EIS.

5.1.2 Cooperating Agencies

On December 8, 2011, in accordance with Title 40 *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 1501.6 (40 CFR 1501.6) of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA and 43 CFR 46.225 of the DOI's regulations for implementing NEPA, Reclamation and NPS invited 25 federal, Tribal, state, and local government agencies to participate in the development of the EIS as Cooperating Agencies. Fifteen of these agencies expressed interest in participating as Cooperating Agencies. The Cooperating Agencies, which include three federal entities, five state agencies, and six Tribes, are listed in Table 5.1-1, along with descriptions of their participation.

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

5.1.3 American Indian Tribes

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

Government-to-government consultation was conducted throughout development of this EIS, in accordance with provisions of the Executive Orders and Secretarial Orders listed above as well as Section 106 of the NHPA, and any additional applicable natural and cultural resource laws (e.g., NEPA, the Endangered Species Act [ESA], NHPA, and Migratory Bird Treaty Act), as well as agency-specific guidance, such as:

- DOI, Departmental Manual, *Departmental Responsibilities for Indian Trust Resources*, 512 DM 2 (1995).
- DOI, Departmental Manual, *Departmental Responsibilities for Protecting/ Accommodating Access to Indian Sacred Sites*, 512 DM 3 (1998).

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 Work 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 EIS.
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 Working 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 EIS.

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 EIS.
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 EIS.
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	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 (WAPA)	Federal	WAPA is a Cooperating Agency in recognition of its role in marketing and transmitting electricity from the Glen Canyon Dam. WAPA representatives participated in the development of alternatives and hydropower performance metrics and provided funds for the hydropower systems analysis.

- 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 EIS. The letters, sent by the joint-lead agencies, provided notification of the intent to prepare the LTEMP EIS; initiated government-to-government consultation; and invited the Tribes to identify concerns related to historic properties, including traditional cultural properties and archaeological sites, natural resources, relevant Indian Trust assets, and other issues of importance.

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

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

5.1.4 Other Consultations

5.1.4.1 National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)

Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulations, requires federal agencies to address the effect of projects on historical properties (i.e., resources determined eligible or listed on the *National Register of Historic Places* [NRHP]) and to give the State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and Traditionally Associated American Indian Tribes, as necessary, a reasonable opportunity to comment on such effects. Reclamation has the lead for Section 106 compliance and initiated the process of consultation with the Arizona SHPO. Consultations regarding eligibility of cultural resources to the NRHP and the effect of the proposed federal action are ongoing. In addition, consultations occurred with Tribal Historic Preservation Officers and Indian Tribes with concerns under E.O. 13007, "Indian Sacred Sites" (U.S. President 1996), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and Section 106 of the NHPA.

On November 30, 2011, 43 Tribes, bands, and organizations were formally invited to enter into government-to-government consultation on the LTEMP EIS (see Section 5.1.3). As part of the consultation process for this EIS, Reclamation will continue to identify concerns, assess the potential for cultural resources impacts, develop appropriate mitigation measures, and seek concurrence with the determination of effect. If adverse effects are identified, Reclamation would continue consultation to seek options to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effects on historic properties. Reclamation, in consultation with interested parties, is developing a Programmatic Agreement to address any cultural resource effects and mitigation measures. Reclamation and NPS conducted a number of formal and informal consultation meetings with Tribes (Havasupai Tribe, Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians, Navajo Nation, and the Pueblo of Zuni) just prior to and after the release of the DEIS.

5.1.4.2 State and Local Water and Power Agency Coordination

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

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

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

5.1.4.3 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)

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

Reclamation and NPS consulted with FWS on the effects of the LTEMP on species listed under Section 7 of the ESA (The Biological Assessment is included in Appendix O of this EIS). This consultation was a continuation of ongoing consultation that has occurred since 1995. Reclamation has consulted with FWS on a total of five experimental actions. The Biological Opinion prepared for the LTEMP supersedes the 2011 opinion on the high-flow experimental protocol and nonnative fish protocols.

5.2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

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

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

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

5.2.1 Public Scoping Process and Comments Received

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

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

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

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

- Phoenix, Arizona (November 7, 2011)
- Flagstaff, Arizona (November 8, 2011)
- Page, Arizona (November 9, 2011)
- Salt Lake City, Utah (November 15, 2011)
- Las Vegas, Nevada (November 16, 2011)
- Lakewood, Colorado (November 17, 2011)

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

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

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

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

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

5.2.2 Public Meetings on Alternatives

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

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

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

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

5.2.3 Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Working Group

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

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

5.2.4 Public Involvement on the LTEMP DEIS

On January 8, 2016, the LTEMP DEIS was filed with Region 9 of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); a Notice of Availability and Notice of Public Meetings were published in the *Federal Register* (81 FR 963); and an email notification of the availability of the DEIS for download from the project website (www.ltempeis.gov) was sent to approximately 600 members of the public who had signed up for notification during the scoping period. Prior to this date, the DEIS was sent to each of the Governors, Senators, and Representatives from relevant congressional districts of the seven Colorado River Basin States (Arizona, California, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, New Mexico, and Wyoming).

In addition to making the DEIS available on the public website, 84 compact disc copies of the DEIS were mailed to individuals at their request; 46 copies were picked up at public meetings held for the DEIS; and copies were made available for public review after the DEIS was published at the following locations:

- J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah, 295 South 1500 East, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112.

- Cline Library, Northern Arizona University, 1001 S. Knoles Drive, Flagstaff, Arizona 86011-6022.
- Burton Barr Central Library, 1221 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.
- Page Public Library, 479 South Lake Powell Boulevard, Page, Arizona 86040.
- Grand County Library, Moab Branch, 257 East Center Street, Moab, Utah 84532.
- Sunrise Library, 5400 East Harris Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89110.
- Denver Public Library, 10 West 14th Avenue Parkway, Denver, Colorado 80204.
- Natural Resources Library, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street NW, Main Interior Building, Washington, D.C. 20240-0001.

The original 90-day public comment period was extended an additional 32 days (122-day total) to May 9, 2016, after several requests were received from the public and Cooperating Agencies. During the comment period, two in-person meetings and two Internet-based webinars were held to provide the public with information about the content and findings of the DEIS and to receive written comments on the DEIS. The meetings and webinars were held on the following dates:

- Webinar—Tuesday, February 16, 2016, at 6:30 p.m. Mountain Standard Time (MST);
- Meeting—Monday, February 22, 2016, at 6:00 p.m. MST, Flagstaff, Arizona;
- Meeting—Thursday, February 25, 2016, at 6:00 p.m. MST, Phoenix, Arizona; and
- Webinar—Tuesday, March 1, 2016, at 1:00 p.m. MST.

At these meetings, LTEMP staff were available to take comments and answer questions before and after presentations were made on the DEIS.

During the public comment period, the public was encouraged to submit comments electronically through the NPS Public, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website. Comments were also received, however, through the mail or using a public comment form provided at the public meetings. More than 3,000 individual comment documents were received on the DEIS. Substantive comments within these documents were used to make changes to the DEIS when deemed appropriate and justified. Responses to comments are provided in Appendix Q of the EIS.

In addition to the public meetings described above, meetings were held with Cooperating Agencies, Tribes, and AMWG stakeholders after the comment review period ended to discuss potential revisions to the EIS.

This page intentionally left blank.