

CONTENTS

Chapter 4. Consultation and Coordination.....	423
Project Development.....	425
Scoping and Public Involvement	425
Internal Scoping.....	425
Public Scoping.....	425
Preliminary Alternatives Development and Review	426
Consultation with Federal and State Agencies	426
U.S. Forest Service.....	426
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer	426
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	427
Consultation with Native American Tribes	428
Reviewing Agencies, Organizations, Businesses, and Individuals.....	429
Federal Agencies	429
Arizona Congressional Delegation.....	429
Indian Tribal Governments.....	429
Arizona State Agencies.....	430
Regional, County, Local and City Governments.....	430
Organizations	430
Businesses	430
Local Libraries	430
Preparers, Contributors, and Reviewers.....	431

CHAPTER 4.

CONSULTATION AND

COORDINATION

This page has been left blank intentionally.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

SCOPING AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Internal Scoping

Internal scoping to identify NPS and USFS specialists' concerns regarding the South Rim visitor transportation plan began formally in February 2006. A week-long internal scoping session was held at the park and included the park's interdisciplinary team, park managers and resource staff, NPS Denver Service Center staff, USFS representatives, and FHWA representatives. During this scoping session the proposed project was discussed, and tours of the project area were conducted to generate initial issues and concerns. The outcome of this scoping session was an initial statement of the purpose and need and a list of goals and objectives for the project. A second week-long internal workshop was held in May 2006 at the park and was attended by the same representatives as the February 2006 meeting. The objectives of this workshop were to develop preliminary concepts for the alternatives and discuss potential impact topic areas.

At a workshop in Denver in October 2006, staff from Grand Canyon National Park, the Denver Service Center, the Federal Highway Administration, consultants, and others identified nearly 100 potential strategies for transportation operations. All were evaluated for preliminary feasibility, and those strategies that did not meet the project's purpose and need, were infeasible for park operations, or required substantial use/redirection of park staff were eliminated.

A Value Analysis workshop was held in March 2007 to begin identification of the agency preferred alternative (NPS 2007h). The Value Analysis process is used to arrive at an optimal solution to a complex issue through a structured and reasoned analysis of the factors and functions related to the issue. It ensures that all viable alternatives are considered, and that

the rationale for decisions is clearly documented. Choosing by Advantages, part of the Value Analysis process, is a systematic approach to evaluating alternatives in context with the value of identified issues, concerns, and functions. The use of Value Analysis is an NPS mandate when evaluating the merits of large projects. Park managers and the interdisciplinary team continued to consider the alternatives and determine the final components of the three action alternatives in May 2007.

Public Scoping

The National Park Service began the formal public scoping process in March 2006 with distribution of a scoping letter. The letter provided background on transportation planning at the South Rim, draft purpose and need statements for the project, identification of the objectives, a definition of the planning framework for the project, and initial project alternatives. The letter also provided information about four public meetings in April 2006. This letter was distributed to approximately 600 individuals and organizations, including state and federal agencies and Native American tribes. The letter was posted on the park's website and was included in a press release.

To develop a public input process that would best meet the needs of all parties to the process, NPS staff spoke with park stakeholders to obtain their recommendations about the format of the scoping meetings and other ways stakeholders could provide input to the process. Information about the planning process was also disseminated, and the stakeholders were notified about how to participate.

Four public scoping meetings were conducted in an open-house format during April 2006. The meetings were held in Phoenix, Arizona; Las Vegas, Nevada; Flagstaff, Arizona; and Tusayan, Arizona. Participants were encour-

aged to visit informational stations, speak with NPS representatives, pick up written information, and provide comments in an informal setting. As part of the 45-day scoping period, the National Park Service invited the public, agencies, and other interested parties to provide comments, suggestions, and input regarding the project scope, issues, and concerns related to alleviating traffic and visitor access concerns at the South Rim.

During this scoping period the National Park Service received approximately 300 comments. Comments are summarized in Appendix B and were used to confirm the purpose and need of the project, identify additional issues to be analyzed in this document, and help refine the range of alternatives. A predominant theme of the comments related to the need for transportation improvements within the South Rim area while protecting natural and cultural resources. Other comments related to types of transit service that should be provided, the need for improvements to the South Entrance Station, and preferences for balancing personal vehicle, tour bus, shuttle bus, and train transportation needs within the South Rim area.

Preliminary Alternatives Development and Review

Based on the scoping comments and input from the project interdisciplinary team and other NPS staff, a set of preliminary alternatives was developed that would best meet the purpose and need for taking action and the project objectives. These preliminary alternatives were described in a newsletter published in August 2006, and the public was requested to identify issues and concerns. Each project alternative addressed multiple transportation components, including options for providing expanded visitor parking, improved tour bus parking and passenger loading, reduced waiting times at the South Entrance Station, improved management of passengers and tour bus traffic associated with the Grand Canyon Railway, and enhanced shuttle bus service.

This newsletter was sent to the original mailing list used for the initial March and April 2006 scoping effort, to those parties that previously commented, and to those who made a request to be added to the mailing list. Comments on the preliminary alternatives presented in the newsletter were reviewed to ensure the alternatives met the project objectives and represented a reasonable range of alternatives for detailed analysis.

CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES

U.S. Forest Service

The U.S. Forest Service participated in the internal scoping efforts held at the park in February and May 2006. In addition, the park contacted the U.S. Forest Service in July 2006 to request natural resource issues or concerns related to proposed alternatives and any survey needs. The U.S. Forest Service was also contacted during the planning process between May and July 2007 for information about archeological surveys and resources plus ethnographic resources. The U.S. Forest Service participated in the workshops for Value Analysis and Choosing by Advantages with the park in February-March 2007 (as described above under “Internal Scoping”) and reviewed this document before public release. The park has also conferred with the U.S. Forest Service regarding tribal consultation.

At the time of the 2006 scoping effort, the National Park Service also contacted other agencies that would have an interest in this project, including the state historic preservation officer, all associated Native American tribes, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to initiate informal consultation and to solicit issues or concerns.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer

The park initiated consultation in March 2006 with both the Advisory Council on Historic

Preservation and the Arizona state historic preservation officer, as stipulated in section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended. Both agencies were notified of the project by letter, which included additional project information for their comment. The National Park Service was identified at this time as the lead agency and the U.S. Forest Service as a cooperating agency.

The National Park Service contacted the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the state historic preservation officer again in August 2006 to provide a status report on the progress of the planning effort, and a copy of the newsletter containing a range of preliminary alternatives and a description of next steps in the process. In August 2006 the National Park Service also sent a letter to the state historic preservation officer describing the proposed project and how the park planned to fulfill section 106 requirements by a document that would meet the needs of the National Historic Preservation Act as well as the National Environmental Policy Act by doing a combined environmental assessment / assessment of effect. Park staff met on-site with state historic preservation office staff on July 30, 2007, to discuss issues and compliance for this and other park projects.

The park had several follow-on conversations with state historic preservation office staff in the fall of 2007 to discuss further refinements to the alternatives being studied, the potential impacts, and the probable need for a memorandum of agreement to address potential adverse effects. The park also discussed preliminary findings of its resource assessment and evaluation work for the South Entrance Road and Mather Point. The park is preparing a draft memorandum of agreement between with the state historic preservation officer and interested tribes for this project. This combined environmental assessment / assessment of effect will be sent to the state historic preservation officer.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was initiated by the National Park Service at a meeting on February 28, 2006, when park staff informed the Fish and Wildlife Service of the project and its intent to initiate consultation.

On March 6, 2006, the park superintendent sent a letter to the USFWS field supervisor, Arizona Ecological Services, requesting comments and a list of endangered, threatened, and candidate species in the project area. The letter indicated that the plan environmental assessment / assessment of effect was not included in the “Batch Consultation for the Park-wide Construction Program” prepared in June 2002 and would require separate consultation, although it was anticipated that the conservation measures developed through that effort would apply to this project.

NPS and USFWS staff met on April 3, 2006 to confirm the species that would be analyzed and the biological assessment, which would accompany the environmental assessment — the bald eagle, California condor, Mexican spotted owl, and sentry milk vetch (if there is suitable habitat in the project area).

NPS and USFWS staff met again on July 18, 2006, to discuss preliminary alternatives. Park staff indicated that the primary project components included in each alternative were related to the parking areas at Canyon View Information Plaza and near Tusayan, as well as a bypass traffic lane near the South Entrance Station and changes to existing shuttle operations. This meeting was followed by a second letter from the park superintendent providing a status report on the progress made on the plan and summarizing the meetings held between NPS and USFWS staff to date. The letter stressed that a key part of the planning process is consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

A fourth meeting between NPS and USFWS staff occurred on October 16, 2006, and the Fish and Wildlife Service was provided a preliminary set of alternatives maps and the newsletter describing these alternatives. During this meeting, USFWS staff outlined concerns and proposed mitigation related to the California condor, Mexican spotted owl, and bald eagle for inclusion in the project's biological assessment.

CONSULTATION WITH NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

The park contacted all associated Native American tribes (Havasupai, Hopi, Hualapai, Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians, Navajo, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, White Mountain Apache, Yavapai-Apache, San Juan Southern Paiute, Pueblo of Zuni, Moapa Band of Paiute Indians, and Las Vegas Paiute) by letter in March 2006 and requested comments on the project scope, issues, and concerns related to alleviating traffic and visitor access concerns at the South Rim. The tribes were contacted again in August 2006, and comments were requested on the set of preliminary alternatives described in the August 2006 newsletter.

In addition, the park conducted meetings with the following tribes to address tribal concerns within the proposed project area:

April 9, 2006	Navajo – Cameron Chapter House
August 23, 2006	Navajo – Cameron Chapter House

October 10, 2006	Hualapai
October 12, 2006	Navajo – Cameron Chapter House
October 30, 2006	Hopi
April 26, 2007	Havasupai
July 11, 2007	Pan-tribal

It should be noted that consultation with the Havasupai was conducted in the 1990s before the construction of the Canyon View Information Plaza. The National Park Service held multiple meetings and conducted site visits with the Havasupai to identify potential sites within the area of potential effects for the South Rim Visitor Transportation Plan. Although general comments from tribal representatives focused on the canyon rim as a place of traditional importance, no specific ethnographic resource locations were identified.

Discussions with the U.S. Forest Service regarding Tusayan indicated that memorandums of understanding with the tribes may have been prepared for the *Final Environmental Impact Statement for Tusayan Growth* (USFS 1999). The park subsequently met with the U.S. Forest Service and several tribes at their quarterly meeting on July 11, 2007. A copy of the environmental assessment / assessment of effect will be distributed to all associated tribes for their review and comment.

REVIEWING AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, BUSINESSES, AND INDIVIDUALS

Approximately 600 agencies, organizations, and individuals are on the mailing list for this plan, including all those who commented during public scoping. Printed copies or compact disks (CDs) of the document are being sent to all those on the mailing list that requested one before the completion of this document. The document is also being posted on the Internet so that it can be downloaded from the park's website (<http://www.nps.gov/grca/parkmgmt/trans.htm>) and from the Planning, Environment and Public Comment website (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca>). Copies are also being made available at the main library in the cities listed below. A complete list of all individuals receiving a copy of this document is on file at park headquarters.

The following is a partial list of the primary agencies, offices, and organizations that will either be notified when the document is available for review or who will be sent a CD or a printed copy.

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture
 Coconino National Forest
 Kaibab National Forest
Department of the Interior
 Bureau of Indian Affairs
 Bureau of Land Management
 Arizona Strip
 Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument
 Bureau of Reclamation
 Regional Office (SLC)
National Park Service
 Arizona State Coordinator
 Bryce Canyon National Park
 Canyonlands National Park
 Flagstaff Area National Monuments Office

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area
Intermountain Regional Office
Lake Mead National Recreation Area
Southern Arizona Group Office
Petrified Forest National Park
Pipe Springs National Monument
Utah State Coordinator
Washington Office
Zion National Park
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
 Arizona Field Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

ARIZONA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Senator John McCain
Senator John Kyl
Congressman Jeff Flake
Congressman Trent Franks
Congressman Raul Grijalva
Congressman Ed Pastor
Congressman Rick Renzi
Congressman John Shadegg
Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords
Congressman Harry Mitchell

INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

Havasupai Tribe
Hopi Tribe
Hualapai Tribe
Navajo Nation
Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians
Las Vegas Paiute Tribe
Moapa Band of Paiute Indians
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
Pueblo of Zuni
Pueblo of Acoma
White Mountain Apache Tribe
Yavapai-Apache Nation

ARIZONA STATE AGENCIES

Office of the Governor
State Historic Preservation Office
Department of Environmental Quality
Department of Transportation
State Parks
Game and Fish Department
Office of Tourism

REGIONAL, COUNTY, LOCAL AND CITY GOVERNMENTS

City of Flagstaff
City of Fredonia
City of Kanab
City of Phoenix
City of Williams
Coconino County Board of Supervisors
Coconino County Sheriff

ORGANIZATIONS

Arizona Trail Association
Grand Canyon Association
Grand Canyon Chamber of Commerce
Grand Canyon Field Institute
Grand Canyon National Park Foundation
Grand Canyon River Outfitters Association

Grand Canyon Trust
National Parks Conservation Association
The Nature Conservancy
Nature Conservancy
Northern Arizona Council of Governments
Sierra Club
The Wilderness Society

BUSINESSES

Delaware North Parks Services
Grand Canyon National Park Airport
Grand Canyon Railway
Grand Canyon School
North Country Grand Canyon Clinic
Paul Revere Transportation
Tusayan Businesses
Verkamp's Inc.
Xanterra Parks and Resorts

LOCAL LIBRARIES

Flagstaff, Arizona
Fredonia, Arizona
Kanab, Utah
Page, Arizona
Phoenix, Arizona
Sedona, Arizona
Williams, Arizona

PREPARERS, CONTRIBUTORS, AND REVIEWERS

The following persons and agencies contributed to the preparation of this environmental assessment / assessment of effect:

Preparer	Title	Company	Contribution/Responsibility
William Byrne	Project Manager	David Evans and Associates	Transportation
Laura L. Meyer	Senior Environmental Planner	David Evans and Associates	Soundscapes
Perry Palmer	Landscape Architect	David Evans and Associates	Site planning/alternatives
Chad Ricklefs	Senior Environmental Planner	David Evans and Associates	Visitor use and experience, transportation
Ed Schumm	Senior Transit Planner	David Evans and Associates	Transportation alternatives
Kara Showalter	EIT, Planner	David Evans and Associates	transportation, visitor use and experience, air quality analysis
Patti Steinholtz	NEPA Planner	David Evans and Associates	Visitor use and experience
Stacy Tschuor	Senior Transportation Engineer	David Evans and Associates	Traffic engineering, South Entrance Station operational analysis
Karen Lusby	Former EA Manager	The Louis Berger Group, Inc.	Management of preliminary draft document, quality review, socioeconomics
Lucy Hackett Bambrey	Senior Project Manager	The Louis Berger Group, Inc.	Cultural resources
Jeff Gutierrez	Environmental Planner	The Louis Berger Group, Inc.	Gateway communities, adjacent land uses
Lori Gutman	Senior Planner	The Louis Berger Group, Inc.	Gateway communities, adjacent land uses
Joel Gorder	Environmental Scientist	The Louis Berger Group, Inc.	Soils and water quality
Dan Niosi	Environmental Scientist	The Louis Berger Group, Inc.	Natural resources
Ed Fleming	Principal	OtterTail Environmental Inc.	Vegetation, wildlife, and special status species coordination
Steve Yarbrough	Senior Biologist	OtterTail Environmental Inc.	Vegetation, wildlife, and special status species
Joe Ramey	Economist	Dornbusch Associates	Socioeconomics
Carey Feierabend	Principal		cultural resources, visual resources, park operations
Greg Sorensen	Principal		Document editing and formatting

Contributor or Reviewer	Title	Agency	Responsibility
J. Patrick Shea	Project Manager / Transportation Technical Specialist	NPS – Denver Service Center	DSC project manager; transportation plan technical assistance
Kim Hartwig	Natural Resource Specialist	NPS – Denver Service Center	Transportation plan technical assistance
David Kreger	Technical Specialist, Natural Resources Compliance	NPS – Denver Service Center	NEPA compliance
Patricia Sacks	Project Specialist / Landscape Architect	NPS – Denver Service Center	DSC A/E manager; transportation plan technical assistance; Value Analysis facilitator
Vicky Stinson	Landscape Architect and Park Project Manager	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Park liaison, alternatives descriptions; construction descriptions; project implementation
Deborah Lutch	Environmental Protection Specialist	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	NEPA and NHPA compliance; natural resources
Jill Beshears	Environmental Protection Specialist	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	NEPA and NHPA compliance
Mary Killeen	Chief, Office of Planning and Compliance	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Project review
Mike Archer	Dept. Chief, Visitor/Resources Protection	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Park operations, visitor protection, emergency services and traffic management
Paul Cox	Fee Collections Program Manager	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	South Entrance Station and fee collections operations
Don Singer	Risk Manager	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Safety
Carl Bowman	Air Quality Specialist	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Air quality
Amy Horn	Park Archeologist	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Archeology data collection, cultural resources
RV Ward	Wildlife Biologist	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Wildlife data collection, wildlife, and threatened and endangered species
Linda Jalbert	Wilderness Planner	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Visitor experience
Ken McMullen	Natural Soundscapes Program Manager	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Soundscapes
Laura Levy	Physical Science Technician; Natural Soundscapes Specialist	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Soundscapes
Lori Makarick	Vegetation Program Manager	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Vegetation and sensitive species
Maureen Oltrogge	Public Affairs Officer	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Gateway communities, visitor information / outreach
Robin Martin	Concessions Specialist/Special Projects	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Transportation system operations and concessions

Contributor or Reviewer	Title	Agency	Responsibility
John Rihs	Earth Sciences Program Manager	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Soils and water resources
Jonathan Upchurch	NPS Transportation Scholar	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Transportation technical specialist, data collection
Greg MacGregor	Chief, Project Management Team	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Park maintenance and operations
Chuck Wahler	Deputy Chief, Interpretation	NPS – Grand Canyon National Park	Visitor experience, interpretation, Canyon View Information Plaza operations
Liz Schuppert	Public Services	USDA Forest Service, Acting Legislative Affairs Specialist	Kaibab National Forest representative on interdisciplinary planning team
Barbara McCurry	South Zone NEPA Planner, Tusayan and Williams Districts	USDA Forest Service, Kaibab National Forest	Cumulative impact scenarios
Bruce Higgins	NEPA Planner	USDA Forest Service, Kaibab National Forest	Gateway communities, adjacent land uses
Michael Lyndon	Archeologist	USDA Forest Service, Kaibab National Forest	Cultural resources
Rick Stahn	Tusayan District Ranger	USDA Forest Service, Kaibab National Forest	Coordination with Kaibab National Forest

This page has been left blank intentionally.