

6.0 Consultation, Coordination, and Document Preparation

This EIS was conducted in accordance with NEPA requirements, CEQ regulations, and the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) and BLM policies and procedures implementing NEPA. NEPA and the associated laws, regulations, and policies require BLM to seek public involvement early in, and throughout, the planning process to develop a reasonable range of alternatives to the Artists' Proposed Action and prepare environmental documents that disclose the potential impacts of the Artists' Proposed Action and alternatives. Public involvement and agency consultation and coordination, which have been at the heart of the process leading to this Final EIS, were achieved through *Federal Register* notices, public and informal meetings, individual contacts, media releases, planning bulletins, and the project web site.

From the initial proposal of the project, the public and agencies have been approached for input on the project scope and development, as discussed in Chapter 1.0. As the complexity of the project became apparent, requiring the involvement of more agencies, the NEPA process developed from an EA to an EIS. This chapter describes this public involvement process as well as other key consultation and coordination activities undertaken for the preparation of a comprehensive Final EIS.

6.1 DESCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC ACTIONS TAKEN TO CONSULT AND COORDINATE

6.1.1. Public Consultation – Scoping

In 1996, the applicant presented a verbal proposal to the BLM RGFO. Based on OTR Corp's verbal proposal, BLM started conducting an EA and held public meetings between 1997 and 2000. Eight public meetings were held in communities within the proposed Project Area:

- April 18, 1997 – Salida
- April 20, 1997 – Cañon City
- December 2, 1997 – Salida
- December 3, 1997 – Cañon City
- December 4, 1997 – Cotopaxi
- October 24, 2000 – Cañon City
- October 25, 2000 – Cotopaxi
- October 26, 2000 – Salida

Additional EA-based scoping was held by BLM in 2006 at the following locations:

- January 17, 2006 – Cañon City
- January 18, 2006 – Cotopaxi
- January 19, 2006 – Salida

During the meetings, BLM took notes as the public provided oral comments. Written comments were also received during the scoping comment period. Based on the comments received during scoping, a specific request from the applicants, the increasing complexity of the project, the level of controversy related to the project, and the level of involvement during scoping process, it was apparent the EA would not likely

result in issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). Therefore, BLM elevated the EA to an EIS-level analysis in March 2006, with the publication of an NOI to prepare an EIS for the Artists' Proposed Action in the *Federal Register* on June 19, 2006.

Concurrent with publication of the NOI to prepare an EIS for the Artists' Proposed Action in the *Federal Register*, a postcard about the OTR EIS status was mailed to the public, stakeholder, and agencies contact lists. Press releases were also provided to multiple media outlets, listed in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1. List of Media Outlets Receiving Various Press Releases

- Associated Press
- Cañon City Daily Record Newspaper
- Chaffee County Times
- Channel 2 News - WB
- Channel 4 News - CBS
- Channel 5 News - KOAA
- Channel 7 News - ABC
- Channel 9 News - KUSA
- Channel 11 News - KKTU
- Channel 13 News - KRDO
- Channel 31 Fox News
- Colorado Community Newspapers
- Colorado Public Radio
- Denver Post
- Florence Citizen Newspaper
- The Flume (online news source)
- Gazette Telegraph Newspaper
- KBVC FM radio
- KHEN FM radio
- KRCC FM radio
- KSBV FM radio
- KUNC FM radio
- Mountain Mail Newspaper
- Pueblo Chieftain Newspaper
- Rocky Mountain News
- Valley Currier (Alamosa News)
- Wet Mountain Tribune Newspaper

BLM continued to accept written comments throughout all stages of project development. Summaries of both written comments and those received at scoping meetings through July 2006 are included in the Scoping Report, available on the OTR web page (http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/rgfo/planning/otr/otr_eis_documents.html).

The issues presented in Table 6-2 are not intended as a comprehensive list of all issues identified during scoping to be evaluated in the EIS; these issues simply represent the key concerns of the public, project team staff, and cooperators.

Table 6-2. Summary of Issues Identified for Further Analysis

Resource	Installation and Removal Phases	Exhibition Window
<p>Emergency Response</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response to industrial accidents • Response to hazardous material spills • Response to recreational accidents (rafting, ATV use, hiking, fishing and climbing) • Search and rescue incidents • Motor vehicle and air craft accidents • Wildfire and stormwater events • Crime incidents • Accessibility for canyon resident health issues • Response times • Adequacy of resources to respond to incidents and existing capabilities of response teams • Accessibility to canyon and evacuation • Emergency coordination and communication issues • Weather and air travel constraints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response to recreational accidents (rafting, ATV use, hiking, fishing and climbing, etc.) • Search and rescue incidents • Motor vehicle and air craft accidents • Wildfire and stormwater events • Crime incidents • Accessibility for canyon resident health issues • Response times • Accessibility to canyon and evacuation • Adequacy of resources to respond to incidents and existing capabilities of response teams • Emergency coordination and communication issues • Weather and air travel constraints
<p>Engineering</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glues and bonding chemicals used during installation • Anchor hole patching during removal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artwork's durability for wind and hail • Geological hazard (fault impacts) • Adequacy of engineering assumptions
<p>Natural and Cultural Resources (including soils, geology, noxious weeds, and wildland fire)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for erosion and river sedimentation • Potential for noxious weed infestation • Potential for rock instability • Assurance of adequate restoration • Stress on natural resources beyond typical current conditions in canyon • Potential damage to cultural resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shading effects on river ecology • Geological hazard from cable vibrations • Potential for erosion and river sedimentation • Potential for noxious weed infestation • Fire danger • Stress on natural resources beyond typical current conditions in canyon • Potential damage to cultural resources
<p>Pollution and Sanitation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for river contamination and water quality • Site aesthetics • Noise and dust resulting from drilling • Potential for river contamination and water quality • Hazardous materials spills • Capacity of area for sanitation, toilet facilities, and trash removal/recycling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debris if artwork collapsed • Potential for river contamination and water quality • Hazardous materials spills • Capacity of area for sanitation, toilet facilities, and trash removal/recycling

Resource	Installation and Removal Phases	Exhibition Window
Public Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insurance and liability issues • Accident potential during construction/removal • Public safety risks and dangers in relation to activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm if artwork collapsed • Insurance and liability issues • General public safety • Potential for threat of terrorism • Considerations of public safety from operation planning
Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic impacts to recreation industries (fishing, rafting/kayaking) • Duration of installation and removal impacts on river and river access for recreation • Effects on natural canyon/river experience and natural beauty • Impacts on nearby area's bicycle and hiking trails and off-road use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cable and fabric panel impacts on recreation, including fishing activities and rafting • Effects on natural canyon/river experience and natural beauty • River safety and conflicts with fabric panels • Exceeding visitor carrying capacity during the busy summer season • Impacts on nearby area's bicycle and hiking trails and off-road use • Recreation experience of viewing artwork • Attraction of new types of visitors to area • Railroad access and use potential
Socioeconomics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs to area, including disruption of life, work, and recreation in canyon • Commercial traffic impacts • Potential for increased crime • Boost for local economy (visitor expenditures) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeding visitor carrying capacity during the busy summer season • Commercial traffic impacts • Potential for increased crime • Effect on local economy (visitor expenditures) • Long-term social effect from work-of-art • Costs paid by artists • Costs to area, including disruption of life, work, and recreation in canyon
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow US 50 cross-section • Delays—increased travel times • Duration and lane closures • Local traffic congestion and access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays—increased travel times • Local traffic congestion and access • Temporary air pollution • Potential for increased crashes • Narrow US 50 cross-section and narrow canyon constraints • Lack of alternate routes • Traffic Management Plan • Drivers' unfamiliarity with environment • Alternate display locations and times • Decreased speed to possibly reduce accidents

Resource	Installation and Removal Phases	Exhibition Window
Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and vibration impacts • Physical disturbance • Wildlife accustomed to human presence, cars, boats, and previously to trains • Habitat and water access limitations • Increased vehicular traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential cable and fabric hazards to wildlife • Increased vehicular traffic • Stress induced by visitor population • Shading effects of fabric panels on wildlife and river ecology • Habitat and water access limitations • Harm if artwork collapsed

An MOU between OTR Corp and BLM was developed and signed for preparation of an EIS in May 2007. In 2007, OTR Corp delivered a Design and Planning Report that included EIS-level alternatives. In April 2008, BLM received additional information with the required level of detail to move forward with the EIS. This led to the process of filing, upper-level agency review of, and publication of a NORA.

A NORA was filed in the *Federal Register* on October 31, 2008. In addition to publication in the *Federal Register*, a paid notice of this document and comment period was printed in The Daily Record. BLM accepted written comments at the RGFO through the official 45-day comment period that ended December 15, 2008. A total of 391 original letters were received during this comment period. Comments were categorized based on their association to affected resources; one comment could be associated with more than one resource. The distribution of concerns is summarized below.

Table 6-3. Summary of Comments Received During the NORA

Resource	Number of Comments Received Associated with Resource
Wildlife (including avian and fisheries)	120
Recreation	20
Public Safety	92
Traffic	102
Visual Resources	131
Physical	54
Ecosystem	51
Socioeconomics	108
Air Quality	15
Realty Authorizations	1
Range/Grazing	2
Noxious Weeds/Invasive Species	4
Trash/Hazardous Materials	10
Water Quality	8

Generally, these comments were associated with previously considered concerns with ACEC goals and objectives, and likely impacts to human and natural environment in the Project Area. Based on these comments, the BLM determined the realty action could proceed to be analyzed in an EIS and considered the comments received as part of the alternatives development. All public comments received on the NORA are available at the BLM RGFO.

6.1.2. Public Consultation – Draft EIS

6.1.2.1. Draft EIS Distribution

The OTR Draft EIS was distributed for public review beginning July 16, 2010. Since initial scoping, BLM has maintained a mailing list of individuals, businesses, special interest groups, and federal, state, Tribal, and local government representatives interested in development of the OTR EIS. In an effort to reduce printing costs, unless recipients expressly requested receipt of a paper copy of the Draft EIS, they were directed to download the Draft EIS from the BLM's web site. Copies of the Draft EIS were also available for public inspection on the project web site and at the following locations:

- BLM RGFO
- BLM Colorado State Office
- AHRA Office
- Local libraries

6.1.2.2. Public Comment Period

Concurrent with distribution of the Draft EIS, an NOA was published by the EPA in the *Federal Register* on July 16, 2010, which marked the beginning of a 45-day review and comment period. On August 14, 2010, the BLM extended the public comment period by 15 days, for a 60-day review and comment period in total. The public comment period ended on September 14, 2010.

The public had the opportunity to comment online through the project web site, at public meetings, and via postal mail, email, or fax.

6.1.2.3. Public Meetings

Four public meetings/hearings were held during the Draft EIS public comment period. The public could ask questions about the Draft EIS and provide oral and written comments at any of the meetings. Each meeting began with an open house and the opportunity to speak with resource specialists about the Draft EIS. This was followed by a formal public hearing, with a court reporter who recorded all oral comments. Written comments could also be submitted at the meetings. The four public meetings/hearings were held August 9-12 in Cañon City, Salida, Cotopaxi, and Denver.

6.1.2.4. Public Comments

All comment submissions received by the BLM during the public comment period were reviewed and evaluated for substantive comments. Over 3,500 submissions were received during the comment period. Within these submissions, more than 4,558 comments were recorded. Table 6-4 displays the number of submissions received. Some submissions contained more than one comment. More comments were received from Colorado than any other location, though comments were submitted from 17 other U.S. states and at least 15 other countries.

Table 6-4. Submissions Received

	Number
Number of form submissions ¹	698
Number of nonform submissions	2,851
Total submissions	3,549

¹Form submissions include duplicate letters, postcards, or emails received from more than one source.

All comments were categorized by topic or resource. Table 6-5 summarizes the number of comments received related to each topic. Some comments may have been assigned to multiple topics, so the total number of comments in Table 6-4 does not match the total number of comments received.

Table 6-5. Summary of Comments by Resource

Resource Type	Total
Air Quality	21
Alternatives	155
Aquatic Wildlife	44
Comments on Art	1,112
Cultural Resources	50
Emergency Response	111
Engineering/Project Design	45
General	39
Grazing	13
Hazardous Waste	15
High Wind and Weather Damage	41
Mitigation/Restoration	172
Natural Resources (General)	187
NEPA Process/Public Involvement	136
Noise	22
Nonhazardous Waste	17
Noxious Weeds	7
Pollution (General)	19
Protected Areas/ACEC	26
Public Safety	204
Purpose and Need	20
Recreation	221
River Ecology/Bank Stability	34
Socioeconomics	943
Soils	40
Terrestrial and Avian Wildlife	384
Threatened, Endangered, and Special Status Species	37
Transportation and Traffic	456
Vegetation/Riparian Areas	29
Visual Resources	241
Water Quality	12
Wildfire	14

6.1.2.5. Response to Public Comments

After the public submissions were reviewed and categorized, summaries were developed for all substantive comments. Each comment summary represented a unique substantive comment received during the comment period. In some cases, multiple substantive comments were combined into one comment summary.

After the comment summaries were finalized, responses were developed for each comment summary. These responses included clarifications and explanations, and noted any revisions that were made to the document as a result of the comment. A full list of comment summaries and responses can be found in Appendix F.

6.1.3. Final EIS

6.1.3.1. Final EIS Distribution

Since initial scoping, BLM has maintained a mailing list of individuals, businesses, special interest groups, and federal, state, Tribal, and local government representatives interested in development of the OTR EIS. In an effort to reduce printing costs, unless recipients expressly requested receipt of a paper copy of this Final EIS, they were directed to download the Final EIS from the BLM's web site.

Copies of the Final EIS also are available for public inspection at the following locations:

- BLM RGFO
- BLM Colorado State Office
- Local libraries

The Final EIS is also available at the Over the River EIS web site:

<http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/rgfo/planning/otr.html>.

Concurrent with distribution of the Final EIS, an NOA was published by the EPA in the *Federal Register*, which marks the beginning of the 30-day availability period.

6.1.4 Agency Consultation

Federal laws require the BLM to consult with certain federal and State agencies and entities and Native American tribes, (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1502.25) during the NEPA decision making process. BLM is also directed to integrate NEPA requirements with other environmental review and consultation requirements to reduce paperwork and delays (40 CFR 1500.4-5). The following section discusses activities conducted during the NEPA process to meet these requirements.

6.1.4.1 Cooperating Agencies

With the publication of the NOI to prepare an EIS for the Artists' Proposed Action, a series of briefings to elected officials, meetings with the Cooperating Agencies and Other Agencies were held to:

- Reintroduce the project and describe the proposed project.
- Describe the project schedule, process, key milestones, and opportunities for public involvement.
- Provide project information and answer frequently asked questions.

- Demonstrate an understanding of the concerns and issues expressed by all interested parties.
- Ensure that we have reached the key stakeholders and obtained their perspectives.

Since the publication of the NORA in the *Federal Register* on October 31, 2008, a series of meetings have occurred with agencies to help BLM in development of this EIS:

- March 24, 2009 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- April 13, 2009 – BLM and CDOT
- April 28, 2009 – BLM and CSP
- April 30, 2009 – BLM and CDOT
- May 7, 2009 – BLM and Chaffee County
- May 7, 2009 – BLM, Cañon City, and Fremont County
- May 7, 2009 – BLM and UPRR
- May 7, 2009 – BLM and CDOW
- May 15, 2009 – BLM, Salida, and State Parks
- May 19, 2009 – BLM and CDOW District Wildlife Managers
- May 28, 2009 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- June 3, 2009 – BLM and State Parks Board
- June 18, 2009 – BLM and State Parks Board
- November 20, 2009 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- November 3, 2009 – Fremont County, CDOT, BLM, and OTR Corp
- February 18, 2010 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- June 15, 2010 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- July 28, 2010 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- September 8, 2010 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- September 21, 2010 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- November 10, 2010 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- December 1, 2010 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- December 9, 2010 – BLM and State Parks
- December 16, 2010 – BLM and CDOW

- January 13, 2011 – BLM and CDOW
- January 24, 2011 – BLM and Fremont County
- January 31, 2011 – BLM and CDOW
- February 1, 2011 – BLM and CDOW
- February 2, 2011 – BLM and Chaffee County Sheriff
- March 1, 2011 – BLM, USFWS, and OTR Corp
- March 16, 2011 – BLM, CDOW, and State Parks
- March 21, 2011 – BLM and Fremont County
- March 23, 2011 – BLM and All Cooperating Agencies (CDNR, CDOT, CSP, Chaffee County, and Fremont County)
- March 30, 2011 – BLM, USFWS, and OTR Corp
- April 8, 2011 – BLM and USFWS
- May 19, 2011 – BLM, USFWS, and OTR Corp

6.1.4.2 Tribal Consultation

Federal agencies are directed by the NHPA to consult with any Indian tribe that attaches religious and cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by an undertaking. Tribal consultation is a government-to-government relationship. The BLM is responsible for this and initiates Tribal Consultation regarding the OTR project as required by law. Tribal consultation is the active, affirmative process of (1) identifying and seeking input from appropriate American Indian governing bodies, community groups, and individuals; and (2) considering their interests as a necessary and integral part of the BLM's decision making process. The aim of consultation is to involve affected American Indian groups in the identification of issues and the definition of the range of acceptable management options.

Under the auspices of the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, Executive Order 13007, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990, and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the BLM must take into account the effects of land use decisions on places (i.e., physical locations) of cultural value to American Indian groups. The BLM works in cooperation with American Indian tribes to coordinate and consult before making decisions or approving actions that could result in changes in land use, physical changes to lands or resources, changes in access, or alienation of lands. Federal programs are required to be carried out in a manner sensitive to American Indian concerns and tribal government planning and resource management programs.

The BLM has consulted with three Ute tribes, as well as 13 Plains tribes. The tribes have not expressed any concerns regarding sacred sites. No design mitigation measures to address impacts, pursuant to NHPA and other relevant historic preservation laws and regulations, along with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act and Executive Order 13007 (entitled "Indian Sacred Sites") are necessary.

6.1.4.3 Fish and Wildlife Consultation

As the lead federal agency, or action agency, BLM is consulting with the USFWS to ensure that the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any federally listed species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, 16 U.S.C. 1532 et seq. On May 18, 2010, BLM sent a letter to the USFWS

requesting review of potential OTR project impacts, assistance regarding measures to reduce project effects, and coordination regarding a Biological Assessment (BA) for the project. USFWS responded to BLM in a June 24, 2010 letter, providing input that resulted in preparation of a BA to review if the action may affect the three federally listed species in the area: Gunnison’s prairie dog, Mexican Spotted Owl, and greenback cutthroat trout. BLM drafted a BA and is providing it to USFWS for review pursuant to informal Section 7 consultation. The ESA consultation process is concurrent with the NEPA EIS process, and the results of Section 7 consultation are provided in Appendix I of the Final EIS.

6.2 LIST OF PREPARERS

As required by NEPA regulations (40 CFR § 1502.17), Table 6-6 lists the people responsible for preparing this Final EIS. The BLM RGFO has retained EDAW/AECOM as a third-party consultant to assist with the preparation of this EIS. EDAW/AECOM was selected by the lead agency in cooperation with the Cooperating Agencies to avoid any conflict of interest. EDAW/AECOM has certified that it does not have any financial or other interest in the decisions to be made pursuant to this EIS.

Table 6-6. Preparers and Reviewers

Name	Company	Responsibilities	Education and Experience
Bureau of Land Management			
Greg Shoop	BLM Front Range District	Front Range District Manager	B.S., Geography 22 years of experience
Keith Berger	BLM RGFO	Field Office Manager	B.S. Range Ecology 20 years experience
Linda McGlothlen	BLM RGFO	Formerly Acting Field Office Manager	37 years experience
Vincent Hooper	BLM RGFO	OTR Project Manager	B.S. Parks and Outdoor Recreation 25 years experience
Joe Vieira	BLM SLVPLC	Former EIS Project Manager; Atmosphere, Air Resources, and Air Quality; Socioeconomics	M.S. Forest Science 18 years experience
Martin Weimer	BLM RGFO	Project NEPA Lead	M.S. Biology 25 years experience
Angela Glenn	BLM State Office	State Office Lead Planning & Environmental Coordinator	B.S. Forestry Resource Management 26 years experience
Erik Brekke	BLM RGFO	IDT Lead/Biologist - Terrestrial/Avian Wildlife and Habitat; Threatened and Endangered Species	B.S. Wildlife Biology 34 years experience
Jim Backstrand	BLM RGFO	Terrestrial/Avian Wildlife and Habitat; Threatened and Endangered Species	M.S. Wildlife Biology 20 years experience
Debbie Bellew	BLM RGFO	Lands and Realty Specialist	28 years experience
Cass Cairns	BLM RGFO	Public Affairs Officer	23 years experience
Stephanie Carter	BLM RGFO	Geologic Substrate and Terrain; Hazardous Waste	B.A. Geology 14 years experience
Mike Cassell	BLM RGFO	Retired ;Soil Resources, Geologic Substrate and Terrain; Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species	B.S. Natural Resources 25 years experience
Dave Gilbert	BLM RGFO	Biologist - Aquatic Wildlife and Habitat; Wetlands, Floodplains, and Riparian	M.S. Wildlife Biology 27 years experience

Name	Company	Responsibilities	Education and Experience
Gene Hunt	BLM RGFO	Hazardous Materials; Waste (Nonhazardous)	B.S. Business Administration Graduate of NTC BLM Hazmat Specialist Curriculum 10 years hazmat experience
Vera Matthews	BLM RGFO	Realty Specialist	5 years experience
John Nahomenuk	BLM RGFO	Recreation; Wilderness Study Areas; ACEC; Visual/Aesthetic Resources; Wild and Scenic Rivers	B.S. Natural Resources/Recreation 21 years experience
Leslie Peterson	BLM RGFO	Petroleum Engineer	B.S. Petroleum Engineering 22 years experience
Jeanette Pranzo	BLM State Office	Socioeconomics	M.A. Economics 38 Years experience
Leah Quesenberry	BLM RGFO	Renewable Resources Staff Supervisor	M.S. Natural Resources 20 years experience
Ken Reed	BLM RGFO	Forestry	B.S. Forest Management 25 years experience
Ed Skerjanec	BLM RGFO	Fire Management Officer, Public Safety	B.S. Communications 24 Years experience
John Smeins	BLM RGFO	Water Resources; Soil Resources	B.S. Watershed Science 10 years experience
Melissa Smeins	BLM RGFO	Paleontological Resources	M.S. Geology 5 years experience
Monica Weimer	BLM RGFO	Cultural Resources and Native American Consultation	M.A. Anthropology 33 years experience
Jeff Williams	BLM RGFO	Range Resources; Vegetation and Plant Communities; Farmlands	B.S. Natural Resource Management 9 years experience
John Lamman	BLM RGFO	Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species	M.S. Range Science 10 years experience
Hugh Wolfe	BLM RGFO	Realty Specialist	30 years experience
AECOM/Subcontractor			
Tom Keith	EDAW/AECOM	Principal-in-Charge	M.S. Natural Resources 30 years experience
Tanya Copeland	EDAW/AECOM	Co-Project Manager	M.S. Biology B.A. Chemistry 16 years experience
Molly Cobbs-Lozon	EDAW/AECOM	Former Co-Project Manager	B.S. Environmental Studies B.A. Political Science 8 years experience
Melanie Martin	AECOM Environment	Co-Project Manager	M.S. Natural Resources Management B.S. Agriculture 12 years experience
Kyle Arndt	AECOM Environment	Project Research and Support	B.S. Natural Resources Management 3 years experience
Bill Berg	AECOM Environment	Paleontological Resources	M.S. Geology 23 years experience

Name	Company	Responsibilities	Education and Experience
Rebecca Brofft	EDAW/AECOM	Recreation Resources	B.S. Natural Resources 2 years experience
Jim Burrell	AECOM Environment	Water Resources	M.S. Civil Engineering B.S. Forest Management 31 years experience
Jeremy Call	EDAW/AECOM	Visual Resources	M.A. Landscape Architecture B.A. Humanities 6 years experience
Rollin Daggett	AECOM Environment	Aquatic Wildlife and Habitat	M.S. Aquatic Ecology B.S. Zoology 35 years of experience
Alan Eckman	AECOM Transportation	Transportation and Traffic	M.B.A. Business Administration B.S. Civil Engineering 11 years experience
Erik Gantt	Centennial Archaeology	Cultural, and Historic Resources and Native American Cultural Concerns	M.A. Anthropology 13 years experience
Chris Gaughan	EDAW/AECOM	Terrestrial/Avian Wildlife and Habitat; Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species	M.S. Wildlife Conservation B.S. Earth Science/Geography 7 years experience
Steve Graber	AECOM Environment	Public Safety	B.S. Natural Resource Management B.A. Economics 6 years experience
Ed Harvey	Harvey Economics	Socioeconomics, Social Impacts	M.S.B.A. Economics B.A. Economics 37 years experience
Michael Heugh	AECOM Transportation	Transportation and Traffic	M.E. Transportation Engineering B.S. Mathematical Sciences 5 years experience
Don Holloway	AECOM Transportation	Transportation and Traffic	B.S. Civil Engineering 23 years experience
Len Joeris	AECOM Environment	Hazardous Materials; Waste (Nonhazardous)	B.S. Social Science 34 years experience
Kimberly Karish	EDAW/AECOM	GIS Specialist and Data Manager	Ph.D. Environmental Planning and Design M.S. Fisheries and Wildlife Ecology B.S. Ecology, Behavior and Evolution 5 years experience
Brian Kennedy	AECOM Transportation	Transportation and Traffic	B.A. Environmental Planning and Design 27 years experience
John Ko	EDAW/AECOM	Wetlands, Floodplains, and Riparian Habitat; Vegetation and Plant Communities; Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species; Range Resources; Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species	B.S. Natural Resources Planning and Interpretation 17 years experience
Dustin Krajewski	AECOM Environment	Hazardous Materials; Waste (Nonhazardous)	M.B.A. Business Administration B.S. Mechanical Engineering 9 years experience

Name	Company	Responsibilities	Education and Experience
Bruce Meighen	EDAW/AECOM	Public Involvement Lead	M.S. City Planning B.A. Geography Urban Systems 15 years experience
Andrew Newman	EDAW/AECOM	Terrestrial/Avian Wildlife and Habitat; Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species	B.S. Conservation Biology 3 years experience
Ben Norman	Harvey Economics	Socioeconomics, Social Impacts	M.S. Agribusiness B.S. Agricultural Economics 5 years experience
Melinda Ogle	Harvey Economics	Socioeconomics, Social Impacts	B.A. Economics 11 years experience
Chad Schneckenburger	EDAW/AECOM	Recreation Resources; Wild and Scenic Rivers; Wilderness and Special Management Areas	M.S. Recreation Resources B.S. Political Science 6 years experience
Melissa Sherburne	EDAW/AECOM	Realty Authorizations and Land Use	M.E.M. Environmental Management B.A. Environmental Studies 7 years experience
Dave Swift	EDAW/AECOM	Bighorn Sheep	Ph.D. Animal Science 30 years experience
Heidi Tillquist	AECOM Environment	Public Safety	M.S. Environmental Toxicology B.S. Fishery and Wildlife Biology 22 years experience
Susan Walker	Harvey Economics	Socioeconomics, Social Impacts	M.S. Forest Economics B.S. Forest Management 9 years experience
Doug Yadon	AECOM Environment	Soil Resources, Geologic Substrate and Terrain; Farmlands	M.S. Civil Engineering (Geotechnical) B.S. General Engineering, Geology 34 years experience
Christian J. Zier	Centennial Archaeology	Cultural, and Historic Resources and Native American Cultural Concerns	Ph.D. Anthropology 35 years experience