

CHAPTER 5 – CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is a description of the public outreach and participation opportunities made available through the development of the Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) and the coordination and consultation efforts to date with tribes, government agencies, and other stakeholders. It includes a list of preparers of the document and the agencies, organizations, and individuals that received a copy of the Draft RMP/EIS for review. There have been and will continue to be many ways for the public to participate in the planning process for public lands under the jurisdiction of the Pocatello Field Office (PFO).

5.2 PUBLIC COLLABORATION AND OUTREACH

5.2.1 SCOPING PROCESS

Scoping is the term used in the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (40 Code of Federal Regulations Parts 1500 et seq.) to define the early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed in the planning process. The scoping process provides an avenue to involve the public in identifying significant issues related to potential land use management actions. The process also helps identify any issues that are not significant and that can thereby be eliminated from detailed analysis. The list of stakeholders and other interested parties is also confirmed and augmented during the scoping process.

5.2.1.1 Notice of Intent

The Notice of Intent (NOI) is the legal document notifying the public of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) intent to initiate the planning process and to prepare an EIS for a major federal action. The NOI invites the participation of the affected and interested agencies, organizations, and members of the general public in determining the scope and significant issues to be addressed in the planning alternatives and analyzed in the EIS. The NOI for the Pocatello RMP was published in the *Federal Register* on November 14, 2001. The scoping period for receipt of public comments ended on June 30, 2003.

5.2.1.2 Press Releases

Local and regional newspapers and radio stations throughout the planning area were used to disseminate information on the Pocatello RMP scoping and planning process. The BLM prepared press releases announcing the official scoping meetings and inviting the public to provide input. The releases, mailed on May 15, May 29, and June 9, 2003, were provided to the following print and broadcast media:

NEWSPAPERS	
Associated Press, Boise	<i>Caribou County Sun</i> , Soda Springs
<i>Idaho State Journal</i> , Pocatello	<i>Idaho Statesman</i> , Boise
<i>Morning News</i> , Blackfoot	<i>News-Examiner</i> , Montpelier
<i>Preston Citizen</i> , Preston	<i>Post Register</i> , Idaho Falls
<i>Power County Press</i> , American Falls	<i>Shelley Pioneer</i> , Shelley
<i>Sho-Ban News</i> , Fort Hall	
TELEVISION	
KIFI Channel 8, Idaho Falls	KIDK Channel 3, Idaho Falls
KPVI Channel 6, Pocatello	
RADIO	
KICN-KLCE, Blackfoot	KVSI, Montpelier
KWIK-KPKY, Pocatello	KZBQ, Pocatello
KSEI, Pocatello	KBYI, Rexburg
KBRV-KFIS, Soda Springs	

5.2.1.3 Public Scoping Notice and Planning Criteria

The BLM prepared a public scoping letter and briefing package and mailed them to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribal Council, Land Use Policy Commission, federal, state, and local agencies, interest groups, and members of the general public on April 23, 2003. The BLM also made the scoping letter and briefing package available for public view on the Internet in April 2003.

The briefing package provided information on the public scoping process, the scheduled open house scoping meetings, and background information on the purpose and need for the planning activity and identified the need for change topics. Preliminary resource issues were identified and summarized, and preliminary planning criteria were also included. These serve as ground rules for the planning process and ensure that efforts are tailored to pertinent issues that will lead to the development of alternatives.

The notice invited the public to participate in the scoping process, to further develop issues and concerns to be addressed in the RMP based on the need for change topics, and to provide comment on the planning criteria. The mailing and e-mail addresses to send comments to were provided in both the scoping letter and briefing package. The mailing list was compiled from data kept by the PFO staff and included over 800 entries.

5.2.1.4 Scoping Meetings

The BLM held public scoping meetings in Montpelier on May 28, in Malad on May 29, in Fort Hall on June 5, in Pocatello on June 10, and in Soda Springs on June 11, 2003. The BLM provided the local media with press releases announcing the time, location, and purpose of these meetings.

The format for the scoping meetings featured informal one-on-one presentations by interdisciplinary team (IDT) members. Attendees signed a registration sheet as they entered the room, then team members escorted them to stations set up around the room, detailing need-for-change items, resource issues, planning criteria, and a proposed schedule for completing the

planning process. Geographic information system (GIS) inventory maps at stations highlighted various resources.

Attendees were encouraged to mail in written comments and questions or to fill out comment cards specific to the Pocatello RMP. Copies of the briefing package and planning criteria were also made available at the comment table.

5.2.2 PROJECT WEB SITE

The BLM maintains an interactive Web site at www.blm.gov/id/st/en/fo/pocatello/planning/pocatello_resource.html to communicate with the public, collaborators, and BLM employees on the RMP/EIS process. The official Web site went online in April 2003, providing updates and information about the revision process. Materials on the Web site include such information as notices and general news regarding the project, RMP/EIS, and meeting schedules, and documents to be reviewed and commented on. Maps showing the planning area, appropriate land status, towns, rivers, highways, and other BLM-approved features are also posted. The BLM continuously updates the Web site with information, documents, and announcements.

5.2.3 NEWSLETTERS

Newsletters are published throughout the course of the RMP/EIS process and are posted on the BLM Web site. Participants also may request to receive newsletters through e-mail. The newsletters remind the public of how they can comment and get involved and includes a calendar of events. Each edition addresses in detail issues of concern identified during the scoping process. The first newsletter was mailed in spring 2004 and addressed sagebrush ecosystems and phosphate mining and selenium release. Newsletters to county commissioners and tribal representatives are mailed, with cover letters addressed to specific individuals. A second newsletter was distributed in fall of 2004 that provided a project update.

5.3 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

The Pocatello RMP will provide guidance for a vast area of public land in southeastern Idaho and necessarily requires the coordination of a wide variety of organizations with interests in the area. Among those are governmental bodies that create, administer, and monitor policy for these, as well as adjacent, lands. The BLM established a coordinated effort in developing the Pocatello RMP by seeking the active participation of these parties.

The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, United States (US) Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) are participating agencies with whom the BLM collaborated in developing the RMP. Representatives of the tribes and agencies attended the kickoff meeting, participated in field trips in September 2003, and attended alternatives development meetings.

The following documents the BLM's consultation and coordination efforts during the preparation of this Draft RMP/EIS. Consultation is an ongoing effort throughout the entire process of developing the final RMP/EIS.

5.3.1 SHOSHONE-BANNOCK TRIBES

On May 15, 2003, before the public scoping meetings, the BLM met with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Land Use Commission and Resources and Wildlife staff specialists to discuss the Pocatello planning effort and to solicit input. In addition, in April 2003 the Tribal Business Council, members of the Land Use Commission, and resource staff specialists were sent individual scoping letters and briefing packages. One public scoping meeting was held on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation on June 5, 2003. Yvette Tuell and Claude Broncho, representatives of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, participated in various IDT meetings.

The BLM recognizes the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes policy statements (**Appendix S**) and continues to consider and consult on potential effects on natural resources related to the tribes' treaty rights and cultural uses.

5.3.2 FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES

Representatives of the USFWS and IDFG supplied comment letters during both the public scoping period and the 90-day public review period for the Draft RMP/EIS. The USFWS and IDFG also participated as members of the BLM IDT developing the Pocatello RMP.

Consultation with the USFWS is required under Section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 before the BLM begins any project that may affect any federally listed or endangered species or its habitat. As part of the formal consultation with the USFWS on this Proposed RMP/Final EIS, a biological assessment (BA) was provided to the USFWS on April 30, 2008 by the Pocatello Field Office Manager regarding the Utah valvata snail. In the BA, the BLM determined that the implementation of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS “may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” the Utah valvata snail on which this consultation occurred. The USFWS concurred with the BLM’s determination via memorandum dated May 20, 2008 (**Appendix T**).

On August 5, 2008 the Pocatello Field Office sent the USFWS an addendum to the original BA. The gray wolf was not included in the original BA because it had been delisted on March 28, 2008, as an experimental/non-essential population (including Idaho). The need for the addendum was a result of a Federal Court in Montana reinstating the gray wolf to the endangered species list on July 18, 2008. The addendum determined that the implementation of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS “would not jeopardize the continued existence of gray wolves.” The USFWS acknowledged the BLM’s determination via memorandum dated August 21, 2008 (**Appendix T**).

The Caribou-Targhee National Forest has been invited to participate in this planning process as well.

5.4 DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

Scoping for the Draft RMP/EIS began in April 2003. The BLM prepared over 800 public scoping letters and briefing packages and mailed them to tribal governments, federal, state, and local agencies, interest groups, and members of the public whose names were compiled from data kept by the PFO. The distribution list has been updated throughout the development of the Draft RMP/EIS. The distribution list of tribal governments, agencies, organizations, and

individuals who had been a part of the Draft RMP/EIS process is available in the administrative record. In April 2005, the BLM sent a mailer to tribal governments, all agencies, organizations and individuals to determine who wished to be removed from or remain on the Draft RMP/EIS distribution list. Those responding, wishing to remain on the distribution list, received the document in the media type requested (e.g., printed summary only, entire printed document, CD with electronic files or download documents from the Internet) when the Draft RMP/EIS was released. Those wishing to download the document from the Pocatello Web site were notified by letter that it was available. The PFO maintains the distribution list for the Draft RMP/EIS, which is available on request.

The Draft RMP/EIS was published and released in January 2007. On January 6, 2007, the US Environmental Protection Agency and the BLM published an NOA in the *Federal Register*, which notified the public of the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and solicited written public comments during the 90-calendar-day review period that ended on April 4, 2007.

The BLM issued a press release on January 4, 2007, and another on January 25, 2007, which announced the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and that four open houses would be held. The BLM also provided instructions on how to submit public comments in the press releases.

On January 5, 2007, the Draft RMP/EIS was available for downloading from the Idaho BLM Web site at www.blm.gov/id/st/en/fo/pocatello/planning/pocatello_resource.html. On the same day, the BLM distributed paper and CD-ROM copies of the Draft RMP/EIS to approximately 365 parties, including elected officials, regulatory agencies, and members of the public. The BLM accommodated additional requests for paper or electronic copies of the Draft RMP/EIS after the initial distribution.

Open houses were held in Soda Springs, Malad City, Pocatello, and Fort Hall, Idaho, during the 90-day public review period. Each open house featured displays, maps, handouts, and interdisciplinary team resource specialists who provided information and answered questions. A total of 88 people attended the open houses.

5.5 DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE PROPOSED RMP/FINAL EIS

An NOA will be published in the *Federal Register* to notify the public of the availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The NOA will also outline protest procedures during the 30-calendar-day protest period.

The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be available for downloading from the Idaho BLM Web site at www.blm.gov/id/st/en/fo/pocatello/planning/pocatello_resource.html. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will also be available for review at the PFO.

Press releases will be issued to notify the public of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS availability.

All recipients of the Draft RMP/EIS and all parties who submitted written comments on the Draft RMP/EIS will receive the Proposed RMP/Final EIS in either a hard copy or CD, or they will be able to download it from the Idaho BLM Web site. The PFO will notify those who previously received the Draft RMP/EIS electronically. The PFO maintains the distribution list for the Proposed RMP/EIS, which is available on request.

5.6 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

5.6.1 METHOD OF COMMENT COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Methods of submitting comments included letters, facsimiles, and e-mail. Official comments that were submitted were in writing only; no verbal comments were made.

To ensure that public comments were properly registered and that none were overlooked, the BLM adopted a two-part management and tracking system. This system involved listing each author's name and then tracking all individual comments with each submission for analysis.

All submissions were made available for public review at the BLM field office in Pocatello, Idaho, unless the person who submitted the comment specifically requested confidentiality. The newsletter and comment cards made available at open houses provided instructions on requesting the confidentiality of individual respondents and how to withhold individual names or addresses from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

After entering written submissions into a tracking list, the BLM read all comments and evaluated them to determine their content. Most submissions contained several individual comments pointing to one opportunity or issue; thus, it was necessary to develop a method to systematically track all individual comments received. This was accomplished through a tracking system, in which individual comments within a longer letter or comment form were numbered for tracking purposes. Individual comments were tallied and analyzed, and written submissions were registered in the administrative record.

5.6.2 SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED

The comment period closed on April 4, 2007. All written comments sent before 12:00 AM on April 5, 2007, were accepted as official comments. These included those sent by US mail postmarked on April 4, 2007, and e-mail messages and facsimiles sent on April 4, 2007, regardless of when they were received. Some comments were duplicated with an electronic mail message and a letter submitted via US mail. Identical comments from the same party were considered only once.

As shown in **Table 5-1**, 52 written submissions were received, including one form e-mail sent by multiple parties (over 1,150 recorded e-mails), but they were counted only once in the totals. Most of the 52 written submissions contained multiple comments on different topics, for a total of 1,404 individual comments (**Table 5-2**). All information received through these comments has been evaluated, verified, and incorporated into the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, as appropriate. Copies of all accepted written submissions are provided in **Appendix U** (Comments Received on Pocatello Draft RMP/EIS), and the BLM's response to each separate comment within each submission appears to the right of each comment.

Table 5-1. Number of Written Submissions on the Draft RMP/EIS per Affiliation

Affiliation	Affiliation Code*	Number of Written Submissions
Federal agency	A	3
State agency	A	4
Local agency/elected official	A	3
Tribes	T	1
Interest and environmental groups	G	10
Businesses	B	2
Individuals	I, F	29
Total		52

*Affiliation codes: I = Individual; B = Business; A = Agency (federal, state, local, and elected officials), T = Native American tribes; G = Interest and environmental groups, F = Form letter

Table 5-2. Letter Submissions Received Sorted by Affiliation and Author Name

Number Assigned to Letters	Author Name	Affiliation	Number of Individual Comments
Agencies			
A-1	Anne Butler	Pocatello Planning and Development Services	3
A-2	Jeff Cook	Idaho State Parks and Recreation	33
A-3	Dallan Nalder	Bear River Conservation and Development Council	6
A-4	Dal Von Atkinson	Franklin County Commissioner	6
A-5	Melissa Gibbs & Christine Waite	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality	21
A-6	Sandi Arena	US Fish and Wildlife Service	6
A-7	Mark Gamblin	Idaho Department of Fish and Game	85
A-8	James Devine	US Geological Survey	8
A-9	Ron Kay	Idaho Department of Agriculture	28
A-10	Christine Reichgott	US EPA, Region X	43
Native American Tribes			
T-1	Alonzo Coby	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	90
Interest and Environmental Groups			
G-1		Eastern Idaho Group of the Sierra Club	42
G-2	Brooks/Smith	The Wilderness Society	66
G-3	Marv Hoyt	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	78
G-4	John G. Carter, PhD	Western Watersheds Project, Inc.	122
G-5	Katie Fite	Western Watersheds Project, Inc.	163
G-6	Katie Fite and Russell Heugins	Western Watersheds Project, Inc./Idaho Wildlife Federation	135
G-7	Katie Fite	Western Watersheds Project, Inc.	175
G-8	Greg Mladenka	SIRA (Southeast Idaho Recreation Alliance)	11
G-9	Craig Shuler	SOAR (Save Our Access and Rights-of-Way)	20
G-10	Katie Fite	Western Watersheds Project, Inc.	3
Businesses			
B-1	Jeff Richards	PacifiCorp	22
B-2	Bruce Winegar	J. R. Simplot Company	2

Table 5-2. Letter Submissions Received Sorted by Affiliation and Author Name (continued)

Number Assigned to Letters	Author Name	Affiliation	Number of Individual Comments
<i>Individuals</i>			
F-1	Form letter (multiple authors)	Individual	5
I-1	B. Sachau	Individual	7
I-2	B. Sachau	Individual	13
I-3	B. Sachau	Individual	25
I-4	Lydia Garvey	Individual	1
I-5	Richard Spotts	Individual	13
I-6	Mike Veile	Individual	2
I-7	Jerald Tower	Individual	1
I-8	Anonymous	Individual	34
I-9	Sam Smith	Individual	6
I-10	Ned C. Tippets	Individual	2
I-11	Jeff Seamons	Individual	1
I-12	Dana Olson	Individual	15
I-13	Joel Gardner	Individual	2
I-14	Gail Hunt	Individual	6
I-15	Ralph Maughan	Individual	5
I-16	Bryce Campbell	Individual	3
I-17	Mike Panting	Individual	3
I-18	Cameron Williams	Individual	3
I-19	Wendy Pratt	Individual	8
I-20	Valerie Gill	Individual	1
I-21	Stephanie Gill	Individual	3
I-22	Grant Williams	Individual	1
I-23	Mark and Wendy Pratt	Pratt Livestock	7
I-24	Richard Reid & Charlotte Reid	Individual	19
I-25	Stanley Campbell	Individual	3
I-26	Geoff Hogander	Individual	42
I-27*	Geoff Hogander	Individual	0
I-28	Peggy Stalworthy and Kelly Bingham	Individual	5
Total:			1404

*Not included in **Appendix U**.

Comments were received concerning a variety of resource issues, although most comments pertained to livestock grazing. **Table 5-3** is a summary of the number of comments received for each resource or resource use addressed in the Draft RMP/EIS. In addition to the comments summarized below, another 36 comments pertaining to the alternatives considered in the Draft RMP/EIS were submitted. A total of 224 other comments could not be placed into a specific resource or resource use category.

Table 5-3. Number of Comments Regarding Each Resource or Resource Use

Resource/Resource Use	Number of Individual Comments Received	Percentage of Comments*
Air quality	29	2.05%
Cultural resources	36	2.55%
Soils	11	0.78%
Paleontological resources	2	0.14%
Vegetation	139	9.84%
fish and wildlife	76	5.38%
Special status species	95	6.73%
Visual resources	2	0.14%
water resources	38	2.69%
Wildland fire management	121	8.57%
Forestry	7	0.50%
Lands and realty	73	5.17%
Livestock grazing	177	12.54%
Minerals and energy	107	7.58%
Recreation	74	5.24%
ACECs and RNAs	21	1.49%
Wilderness Study Areas	4	0.28%
Designated Watchable Wildlife Areas	0	0.00%
Wild and Scenic Rivers	0	0.00%
Socioeconomic resources and environmental Justice	25	1.77%
Native American tribal issues	16	1.13%

*Total percentage of comments received does not equal 100 percent because 260 recorded comments were not specific to a resource or resource use and therefore do not appear in this table.

5.6.3 COMMENT LETTERS AND BLM RESPONSES

Letters, e-mail messages, and facsimiles containing written comments on the Draft RMP/EIS are reprinted in the order they were coded. **Appendix U** contains comments and the BLM's responses. Each comment is outlined and coded using the letter number within each affiliation type, the affiliation type, and the comment number within the letter (e.g., 2-A-3, where the comment is the third individual comment within the second agency letter). Affiliation types include A (agency), I (individual), B (business), T (Native American tribe), F (form letter), and G (interest or environmental group). A vertical line and the comment code note each separate comment within each letter. The BLM's response to each comment is printed to the right of each comment.

5.7 LIST OF PREPARERS

An IDT of resource specialists from the BLM PFO prepared this RMP/EIS. Tetra Tech, Inc., and Maxim Technologies, Inc., a subsidiary of Tetra Tech, assisted the BLM in preparing these documents and in the planning process (**Table 5-4**). Also providing assistance were Yvette Tuell and Claude Broncho of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Jim Mende of IDFG, Dwayne Winslow and Deb Mignogno of the USFWS, Lloyd W. Briggs of the Idaho Falls District Resource Advisory Council, and the US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.

Table 5-4 List of Preparers

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
POCATELLO FIELD OFFICE			
Candida Aguirre	16	Lands and Realty	BLM Lands and Realty Professional Development Studies
Jim Bowmer	3	Forestry, Vegetation	BS, Forest Resources
Ray Brainard	30 (Retired)	Forestry, Vegetation	BS, Forestry Management MS, Forestry
Jeff Cundick	17	Minerals, Oil and Gas, Geothermal Resources	BS, Mining Engineering MBA, Business
Cleve B. Davis	6	Special Status Species (flora), Vegetation	BS, Botany
Amy Lapp	3	Cultural Resources	MS, Anthropology, BS, Anthropology
Geoff Hogander	28 (Retired)	Fish and Wildlife, Vegetation, Air, Soils and Geology	BS, Fish and Wildlife Management
Brian Holmes	4	GIS	BS Zoology MS, Biology
James Kumm	19	Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species (fauna), Vegetation	BS, Wildlife Biology MS, Wildlife Sciences
Becky Lazdauskas	12	Lands and Realty	BS, Natural Science
Blaine Newman	13	Recreation, Visual Resources, Special Designations	BS, Wildland Recreation Management
Paul Oakes	33 (Retired)	RMP/EIS Planning Coordinator	BA, Biology, Graduate studies in soils
Dave Pacioretty	20	Field Office Manager	BS, Rangeland Science
Matt Rendace	25	Vegetation, Livestock Grazing	BS, Range Management
Terry Lee Smith	21	RMP/EIS Project Manager, Fire Management, Socioeconomics, Cultural/Paleontology, and Vegetation	BS, Agriculture MS, Forestry and Range Management
Mitch Werner	18	Writer, Editor	BBA, Marketing/Film and Video Production
US FISH AND WILDLIFE			
Troy Smith	1	Wildlife, Special Status Species	BS, Wildlife Resources MS, Forest Science
IDAHO FISH AND GAME			
Martha Wackenhut	8	Wildlife, Special Status Species	BS, Wildlife MS, Biology/Zoology

Table 5-4. List of Preparers (continued)

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
CONTRACTOR – TETRA TECH, INC.			
Cynthia Adornetto	24	Project Manager, Greater Sage-Grouse Analysis, QA/QC, Document Production, Administrative Record	MS, Environmental Policy and Management, University of Denver; BS, Natural Resources Management, Colorado State University
Kevin T. Doyle	18	Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources, Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests	BA, University of California, Santa Barbara
Michael Egan*	17	Mineral Resources	BS, Geology, Montana State University
Cameo Flood	20	Forestry, Fire Management	BS, Forest Resource Management, University of Montana
Derek Holmgren	7	Lands and Realty, Visual Resources	MPA and MSES, Indiana University; BS and BA, Oregon State University
W. Wynn John*	5	Air Quality	MS, Geological Engineering, University of Utah; BS, Environmental Earth Science, University of Utah
Genevieve Kaiser	15	Socioeconomics, GIS	MS, Energy Management and Policy, University of Pennsylvania; BA, Economics, College of William and Mary; Professional Certification: GIS, University of Denver
David Kane*	18	Vegetation, Invasive Species Management, Fire Management, Livestock Grazing	PhD, Ecology and Conservation Biology, University of Denver; BS, Wildlife Ecology, University of Wyoming
Matt Loscalzo	6	QA/QC, Document Production, Administrative Record	MS, Environmental Studies, University of Colorado; BA, Political Science, Binghamton University
Neil Lynn*	6	Biological Assessment, Greater Sage-grouse Analysis, Administrative Record	BS, Wildlife Biology, Colorado State University
Mike Manka*	12	Special Status Species, Fish and Wildlife, Wilderness Study Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers	BS, Biological Sciences, Ecology and Systematics, Cornell University
Joy McLain	9	Water Quality, Special Status Species	BS, Environmental Health/Biology minor, Boise State University
Bindi Patel*	4	Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice	MEM, Duke University; BA, Washington and Lee University
David Steed	14	Initial Assistant Project Manager	BS, Idaho State University

Table 5-4. List of Preparers (continued)

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
Randolph Varney	16	Writer, Editor	MFA in Writing, University of San Francisco; BA, Technical and Professional Writing, San Francisco State University
Walt Vering	12	Aquatic Resources	MS, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point; BA, Wartburg College
Valerie Waldorf*	10	GIS, Socioeconomic Support, Public Participation (newsletters)	MBA, University of Utah; BS, Westminster College
Ed Yates*	14	Compliance Oversight	JD, Law, University of San Diego School of Law; BA, Political Science, University of California, Davis
Ann Zoidis	12	QA/QC	MS, Physiology and Behavioral Biology, San Francisco University; BA, Geological Sciences, Smith College
SUBCONTRACTOR – EMPSi: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING SOLUTIONS, INC.			
Angie Adams*	13	Recreation, Administrative Designations	BA, Biology, Drake University
David Batts*	15	Project Manager, Water Resources and Soils	MS, Natural Resource Planning, Michigan State University; BS, International Development, Lewis and Clark College
Holly Prohaska*	8	Livestock Grazing	MS, Environmental Management, University of San Francisco; BA, Marine Science, Biological Pathway, University of San Diego
Kate Wynant*	3	Document Production/ Technical Review, Administrative Record	BA, Environmental Studies, University of Colorado
Jennifer Zakrowski*	10	Project Manager, Recreation and Administrative Designations	MSM, Project Management, Regis University; BS, Public Affairs, emphasis in Natural Resource Management, Indiana University

*Former employee of Tetra Tech, Inc.