

Chapter 5 – Consultation and Coordination

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 5 – CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 Introduction

Integrated with the planning, analysis, and review activities of EIS preparation, the BLM is conducting a comprehensive program of agency coordination and public participation, commencing with scoping early on and continuing throughout the environmental process. The intent of the program is to proactively encourage interaction between the BLM and other federal, state, and local agencies and the public to keep them informed about the Project through dissemination of information and to solicit information that assists in analysis and decision-making.

Throughout the preparation of the EIS, formal and informal efforts have been made by the BLM to involve, consult, and coordinate with other federal agencies, state and local governments, American Indian tribes, and the public. Such communication is important (1) to ensure the most appropriate data have been gathered and employed for analysis and (2) to ensure agency policy and public sentiment and values are considered and incorporated into decision-making.

This chapter provides a brief description of the methods employed for communication and interaction, which includes consultation and coordination with agencies, tribes, and stakeholders; the scoping process; Proponent-initiated activities; and public review of the Draft EIS.

5.2 Consultation and Coordination

Agencies and organizations having jurisdiction and/or specific interest in the Project were contacted at the beginning of scoping, during the resource inventory, and prior to the publication of the EIS to inform them of the Project, verify the status and availability of existing environmental data, request data and comments, and solicit their input about the Project. Additional contacts were made throughout the process to clarify or update information. All conversations with agency personnel were documented, were distributed to the appropriate Project personnel, and are maintained in the Project files. Specific concerns and recommendations were discussed and documented for further action. This section describes the consultation and coordination activities that occurred throughout the EIS process.

5.2.1 Cooperating Agencies

In late July and early August 2009, the BLM sent formal letters inviting 20 agencies to participate in the EIS as cooperating agencies. Of the 20 agencies, 13 responded positively to the BLM's invitation. The agencies invited to participate are listed below. The agencies participating as cooperating agencies are marked with an asterisk. The organizations included the following:

Federal Agencies

- USFS
 - Dixie National Forest*
 - Fishlake National Forest*
- USACE*
- National Park Service*

Utah State Agencies

- PLPCO*
- SITLA*

Local Governments

- Counties: Sevier*, Millard*, Beaver*, Washington*, and Iron*
- Municipalities: Aurora, Beaver, Elsinore, Enterprise*, Joseph, Milford, Minersville, Richfield, St. George*

In addition, after the initial invitation had been sent, it appeared Garfield and Piute counties could be crossed by the proposed transmission line. In mid December 2009, these two counties were invited but declined to participate in the process as cooperating agencies.

Conference calls of the Agency ID Team, including the cooperating agencies, are conducted twice each month to discuss the status of the Project and EIS. Meetings have been, and will continue to be conducted at key milestones of the NEPA. The initial meeting of the Agency ID Team, which includes the cooperating agencies, was held on October 14, 2009. The purpose of the first meeting was to introduce the Project, discuss the purpose of and need for the Project, discuss the description of the Project, scoping, EIS and Project schedule, future coordination, agency actions and decisions, alternative routes to be considered, and issues to be addressed in the EIS. A second meeting was conducted on March 25, 2010, to review the resource inventory data and to discuss the approach for impact assessment and mitigation planning. A third meeting was conducted on July 15, 2010, to review the impact assessment and discuss the screening and comparison of the alternative routes. A fourth meeting was conducted on November 9, 2010, to review and discuss comments on the administrative Draft EIS before the document was completed and released for public review.

5.2.2 Formal Consultation

The BLM is required to prepare EISs in coordination with any studies or analyses required by the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), ESA (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and the NHPA, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

5.2.2.1 Biological Resources

Under provisions of Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, a federal agency that carries out, permits, licenses, funds, or otherwise authorizes an activity must consult with the FWS as appropriate to ensure the action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species listed as threatened or endangered. In accordance with these regulations, the BLM initiated informal consultation with the FWS in September 2009. On November 2, 2009, the FWS attended an interagency meeting with the BLM, USFS, and UDWR to identify and discuss concerns regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Action on wildlife resources, including federally listed species.

In September 2009, the BLM requested a list of any federally listed, sensitive, endangered, and/or threatened species that may occur in the Project area. The species list included in the letter was obtained from the FWS Region 6 website, which provides county-level lists for Utah (Sevier, Millard, Beaver, Iron, and Washington counties).

The BLM formed a Biological Resources Task Group composed of the biologists from the BLM, USFS, and UDWR. The group meets via conference call once a month to discuss status of the Project, issues, and approach.

A draft Biological Assessment is being prepared and will be submitted to the FWS after the selected route has been identified. Submittal of the Biological Assessment will initiate the beginning of the formal Section 7 process.

5.2.2.2 Cultural Resources

Section 106 of the NHPA requires the BLM and the cooperating federal agencies to consider the effect of the agencies' undertakings on properties listed in or eligible for the NRHP (which can include a diversity of archaeological, historic, and traditional cultural resources). Regulations for Protection of Historic Properties (36 CFR 800) implement Section 106 and define a process for federal agencies to use in consulting SHPOs and other interested parties as they assess the effects of their undertakings. Pursuant to those regulations, the BLM initiated Section 106 consultation with the Utah SHPO in April 2010. Those consultations are ongoing and will continue during post-EIS phases of Project implementation. The BLM also invited the ACHP to participate in the Section 106 process. The ACHP accepted the invitation and will consult on the Project.

The purpose of the Section 106 consultations is to solicit expressions of concern, collect relevant data, obtain reviews of the analysis of the collected information, and negotiate a PA specifying how cultural resources would be considered during the EIS and post-EIS phases of Project-planning and implementation. A PA is being developed among the various agencies and consulting parties (including special interest organizations and the Proponent) involved with authorizing the Project. The BLM Fillmore Field Office is serving as the lead for Section 106 compliance. Signatories to the PA include the BLM, USFS, ACHP, BIA, SHPO, SITLA, and the Utah Department of Transportation. Representatives of these agencies are participants in the Cultural Resources Task Group, a formalized group that meets once a month to discuss Project status, issues, and approach. One invited signatory, the Proponent, and 17 concurring parties also are participating in the PA.

Cultural resource studies involving the collection of Class I data and a Class II field reconnaissance were conducted to identify and assess potential impacts the proposed Project may have on cultural resources and to support the evaluation of Project alternatives for the EIS. In compliance with the NHPA Section 106 requirements, an intensive Class III inventory is being conducted on all alternative routes until a selected route is identified to locate those cultural resources that occur within the Project's APE. All the alternative routes are being surveyed due to schedule constraints. Once an alternative route is selected, surveys will focus on that route. The results of this study will be documented in separate reports to support the BLM's on-going consultations with the Utah SHPO and the ACHP.

Tribal consultation is required in all steps of the NHPA Section 106 process when a federal agency undertaking may affect historic properties that are either (1) located on tribal lands or (2) when any tribe attaches religious or cultural significance to the historic property, regardless of the property's location. In such cases, the federal agency must notify the potentially affected tribes of the undertaking and give those tribes the opportunity to consult should they wish to do so.

Early in the environmental process, the BLM initiated contact with several tribes in accordance with various environmental laws and E.O.s¹. In December 2009, the BLM Cedar City Field Office sent a letter and Project area map to 14 tribes to solicit input from them regarding cultural resource concerns (which

¹ NEPA, NHPA as amended, AIRFA, NAGPRA, as amended, FLPMA, ARPA, E.O. 11593 – Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment, E.O. 12898 – Environmental Justice, E.O. 13007 – Indian Sacred Sites, E.O. 13175 – Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments

also is in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA). The Project alternative routes do not cross Indian Reservation lands; however, these 14 tribes may have interest in cultural resources in the Project area. The 14 tribes contacted include the following:

- Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
- Ute Tribe
- Hopi Tribe
- Navajo Nation
- Southern Ute Tribe
- Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
- White Mesa Ute Tribe
- Kaibab Paiute Tribe
- Navajo Utah Commission
- Moapa Band of Paiutes
- Northwest Band of Shoshone
- Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe
- San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe (letter returned undeliverable on January 10, 2010)
- Goshute-Ibapah Tribe

In addition, BLM initiated consultation meetings with the tribes in October 2009, meeting with the Navajo Nation, Hopi Tribe, Moapa Band of Paiutes, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Northwest Band of Shoshone, and Goshute-Ibapah Tribe. The tribes did not express specific concerns or objections to the Project. All requested to be kept informed of Project developments and updated on the EIS process. BLM continued meeting with tribes in spring/summer 2010. The Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah expressed an interest in participating in the Project. On August 2, 2010, the BLM met with the Council of the Paiute Tribe of Utah to update them on the status of the Project and discuss the tribe's concerns. On November 16, 2010, the BLM sent a letter to the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah offering field visits of all alternative routes.

5.2.3 Other Coordination

Several federal and state agencies and local governments were engaged during the course of the environmental studies to request data and solicit information and comments. A list of all agency and stakeholder meetings is presented in Appendix C.

5.3 Scoping Process

The scoping process is purposefully conducted early in the EIS process and is open to all interested agencies and public. The intent is to solicit comments and identify issues that help direct the approach and depth of the environmental studies and analysis needed to prepare the EIS. Objectives to meet this goal include the following:

- Identifying and inviting agencies with jurisdiction and/or special expertise relevant to the Project to participate in the preparation of the EIS as cooperating agencies
- Identifying other interested parties and inviting them to participate in the EIS process
- Identifying other environmental review and consultation requirements
- Identifying the relevant and substantive issues that need to be addressed during the studies and in the EIS

- Determining the range of alternatives to be evaluated
- Developing the environmental analysis criteria and systematic process, allocating EIS assignments among agencies, as appropriate

The scoping process is summarized in this section and documented in the *Sigurd to Red Butte No. 2 – 345kV Transmission Line Project EIS Scoping Report* (BLM 2010a), which is available for viewing at the BLM field offices and on the BLM Project website, http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/cedar_city/planning/sigurd_red_butte.html. The issues derived from scoping comments are listed in Chapter 1, Table 1-1.

5.3.1 Approach

The range of issues summarized in this chapter has been derived from the scoping process and ongoing public involvement. Some of the activities implemented early in the Project are listed below.

- Agency, interagency, and stakeholder meetings (listed in Appendix C) were held to discuss the Project and to solicit comments.
- Announcements to inform the public of the Project, EIS preparation, and public scoping meetings included the *Federal Register* NOI, media releases to local newspapers and radio stations, legal notices, and the ENBB.
- A newsletter was distributed to interested parties on the Project mailing list, which includes federal, state, and local government agencies, special interest groups, and individuals—a total of 5,322 parties (3,885 landowners and 1,437 individuals on BLM’s EIS mailing list). The newsletter introduced the Project, solicited input for the environmental analysis, and announced upcoming public scoping meetings.
- A telephone voice message information line (801-349-2893 and 888-666-6470) was established to provide opportunity for the public to learn about the Project status and/or request information.
- The BLM established a Project website. The website contains a brief description of the Project, the need for the Project, and an EIS timeline. The website can be found at http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/cedar_city/planning/sigurd_red_butte.html. A link was provided for the public to submit comments via email at utsrbproj@blm.gov.
- The Project was posted on the BLM ENBB <https://www.blm.gov/ut/enbb/index.php>, NEPA Log Number C010-2009-0048.
- Four formal public scoping meetings were held in February 2010, one each in St. George, Enterprise, Milford, and Richfield, Utah, to introduce the Project, explain the purpose of and need for the Project, describe the Project, explain the planning and permitting process, and solicit comments useful for the environmental analysis.

In addition, the Proponent assembled two CWGs (a northern and southern group) representing diverse interests associated with the Project area. To date, each CWG has met three times at key points in the process to provide input to the Proponent on the Project.

5.3.1.1 Notification

A NOI was published in the *Federal Register* on January 5, 2010, announcing the preparation of the EIS for the proposed Project and the opportunity for the public to participate in the process and provide input. The publication of the NOI initiated the 60-day public scoping period (January 5 to March 5, 2010).

The first in a series of newsletters was mailed by the BLM on January 27, 2010, to approximately 1,400 individuals, agencies, and interested organizations on the Project mailing list. In addition, the Applicant prepared a list of the landowners within a 2-mile-wide corridor along the alternative routes (1 mile on either side of the reference centerline and approximately 3,900 landowners), sent a letter introducing the Project, and encouraged the landowners to participate in the federal scoping process. Advertisements and paid legal notices were placed in local newspapers, including the *Beaver Press*, *Iron County Today* (advertisement only), *Millard County Chronicle Progress*, *Richfield Reaper*, and *St. George Spectrum* (Table 5-1). Also, Project information was posted on the Project website and a notice was posted on the ENBB.

Newspaper	Advertisement Publication Dates	Legal Notice Publication Dates
<i>St. George Spectrum</i>	January 27, 2010; February 10, 2010	January 9, 2010
<i>Beaver Press</i>	January 28, 2010	January 13, 2010
<i>Millard County Chronicle Progress</i>	January 27, 2010	January 13, 2010
<i>Richfield Reaper</i>	January 27, 2010	January 13, 2010
<i>Iron County Today</i>	January 28, 2010	No legal notice was published

Public Meetings

Four public scoping meetings were held in February 2010 to inform the public about the Project and the EIS process and to solicit input on the scope of the Project and potential issues. An open-house format was used for the meetings. Information was presented on the purpose of and need for the Project, a description of the Project, and the planning and permitting process. Representatives from the BLM, the Proponent, and the third-party environmental consulting team assisting the BLM, EPG, were present and available to explain the displays and answer questions. A total of 77 members of the public attended the scoping meetings. The four public scoping meetings were held at the locations and dates listed below:

St. George, Utah
 Tuesday, February 16, 2010
 6:00–8:00 p.m.
 Best Western Abbey Inn

Enterprise, Utah
 Wednesday, February 17, 2010
 6:00–8:00 p.m.
 Enterprise High School

Milford, Utah
 Wednesday, February 17, 2010
 6:00–8:00 p.m.
 Oak Tree Inn

Richfield, Utah
 Thursday, February 18, 2010
 6:00–8:00 p.m.
 Sevier Valley Center Snow Valley College

Verbal comments provided during the scoping meetings were documented in meeting notes to include in the scoping report. Written comments were accepted at the public scoping meetings, via electronic mail, and via United States mail at the BLM Cedar City Field Office.

5.3.2 Scoping Results

The results of scoping efforts early in the process are documented in the *Sigurd to Red Butte No. 2 – 345kV Transmission Line Project EIS Scoping Report* (BLM 2010a).

5.3.3 Information Dissemination

Mailing lists maintained by the BLM Cedar City Field Office, St. George Field Office, Kanab Field Office, Fillmore Field Office, Richfield Field Office, and the Dixie and Fishlake National Forests were compiled along with a list of federal, state, and local agency representatives, community leaders, and potential stakeholders. Ranchers with grazing allotments on lands administered by the BLM and/or USFS and current BLM lease holders, whose contact information was extracted from the LR 2000 database, also were added to the Project mailing list. Other additions included interested organizations and individuals who commented on the Project or requested information. The mailing list is used to distribute Project information.

As explained in Section 5.2, information about the Project was disseminated early in the environmental process. The publication of the NOI in the *Federal Register* marked the beginning of the EIS and scoping. Additional notifications included press releases and paid legal notices, newsletters distributed to those on the Project mailing list, public scoping meetings, the Scoping Report, stakeholder meetings, posting the Project on the BLM's ENBB, and the Proponent's community leader briefings and CWG meetings.

The availability of the EIS was announced through a *Federal Register* Notice of Availability, press releases, paid legal notices, Project newsletters, the BLM Project website, and the ENBB. Also, newsletters announcing the availability of the Draft EIS were sent to those on the mailing list.

5.3.4 Public Review of the EIS

This Draft EIS has been distributed for review and comment by agencies, interested organizations, and individuals for a period of 45 days. During the 45-day comment period, public open houses will be held for the BLM to receive comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIS. The meetings will be held in the same locations as the scoping meetings: St. George, Enterprise, Milford, and Richfield. A total of four open-house meetings will be conducted to provide ample opportunity for the public to comment on the Draft EIS. All comments received from the Draft EIS review and public meetings will be compiled, analyzed, summarized, and responded to in the Final EIS. It is anticipated the Final EIS will be published in the spring of 2012 followed by a 30-day comment period before the BLM and USFS may issue the RODs. The Draft EIS was posted to the Project website; electronic copies were produced on CD-ROM for distribution. The Draft EIS has been distributed to agencies required to review the Draft EIS, and to other agencies, organizations, and individuals that requested copies. Project status was updated on the Utah BLM ENBB.

All written comments must be received 45 days after the Notice of Availability was published by the EPA in the *Federal Register*. Comments on the Draft EIS may be submitted orally or in writing at the scheduled public open house meetings, or in writing by letter or electronic mail to the BLM (as instructed in the letter to the readers at the beginning of this document). Dates and addresses of the public open house meetings will be announced through a Project newsletter, advertised in local news media, and listed on the Project website: http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/cedar_city/planning/sigurd_red_butte.html at least 15 days in advance of the meetings.

5.4 Proponent-Initiated Activities

As explained previously, two CWGs (a northern and southern group) were formed by the Proponent to provide a forum for input into the transmission line siting studies. The CWG consisted of representatives from cities, counties, and stakeholders in the northern and southern portions of the Project area. While the CWG was not a decision-making entity on the Project, the CWG members were asked to provide feedback on the Project and consider the views of the group, as well as the views of their respective organizations and/or communities. To date, the CWGs have met at key points of the Project, as follows:

- The first round of CWG meetings was held in October 2009 in Cedar City and Richfield, Utah. The purpose of the meeting was to (1) introduce the proposed Project, (2) gather input regarding the scope of the Project and alternative routes, and (3) identify issues that would help the Proponent in developing the transmission line.
- The second round of CWG meetings was held in April 2010 in Fillmore and St. George, Utah. The purpose of the meeting was to provide the CWG with new Project information (scoping results, alternative route information, resource inventory data, etc.)
- The third round of CWG meetings was held in January 2011 in Richfield and Beaver, Utah. The purpose of the meeting was to gather feedback from the CWG about the Proponent’s efforts to address issues identified in the public scoping process.

In addition, the Proponent posted a basic description of the Project on their company communications website (www.pacificorp.com/transmission) and conducted briefings of community leaders to introduce and keep them informed about the Project.

5.5 Preparers and Contributors

Preparers and contributors involved throughout the Project, including BLM and USFS staff, and consultants, are listed in Tables 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4.

TABLE 5-2 BLM PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	Title	Involvement
Cedar City Field Office		
Elizabeth Burghard	Assistant Field Manager	ACECs, BLM natural areas, recreation, visual resources
Craig Egerton	Natural Resource Specialist	Farmlands (prime and unique), floodplains, hydrology, invasive species and noxious weeds, soils, water resources (drinking, ground, surface)
Dan Fletcher	Rangeland Management Specialist	Rangeland health standards, vegetation, livestock grazing
Molly Galbraith	Rangeland Management Specialist	Soils, hydrology
Gina Ginouves	NEPA/Planning	NEPA compliance review
Chris Hite	Geologist	Geology, mineral resources, energy production, paleontology
David Kiel	Recreation Specialist	Recreation, visual resources, wilderness characteristics
M. Mendenhall	Fuels Specialist	Fuels and fire management

**TABLE 5-2
BLM PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS**

Name	Title	Involvement
Randy Peterson	Safety Officer	Wastes (hazardous or solid)
Christine Pontarolo	Lead Project Biologist	FWS consultation; migratory birds; threatened, endangered, candidate, and sensitive plant and wildlife species
Nathan Thomas	Archaeologist	Cultural resources
Sheri Whitfield	Wildlife Biologist	Fish and wildlife excluding FWS-designated species; migratory birds; threatened, endangered, candidate or sensitive plant and wildlife species,
Rob Wilson	Realty Specialist	Environmental justice, socioeconomics
Kevin Wright	Rangeland Management Specialist	Wetlands/riparian zones
Richfield Field Office		
Stanley Adams	Safety/Hazmat Officer	Hazardous or solid waste
Bob Bate	Fuels Specialist	Fuels, woodland/forestry
Nancy Demille	Realty Specialist	Environmental justice, lands, access, socio-economics
Larry Greenwood	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife biology, threatened and endangered species, vegetation, wetlands, fish, riparian
Craig Harmon	Archaeologist	Tribal consultation
Brant Hollows	Rangeland Management Specialist	Soils, watershed, farmland, floodplains
Myron Jeffs	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, wilderness/wilderness study areas, wild and scenic rivers
Francis Rakow	Geologist, Paleontologist	Paleontology, geology
Wayne Wetzel	Associate Field Office Manager	Project management
Burke Williams	Rangeland Management Specialist	Livestock grazing, invasive species
Phil Zeig	Soil Conservationist	Air quality, water resources
Fillmore Field Office		
Steve Bonar	Outdoor Recreation Planner	ACECs, recreation, visual resources, wild and scenic rivers, wilderness/wilderness study areas, wilderness characteristics
Paul Caso	Rangeland Management Specialist	Water resources/quality (drinking, ground, surface)
Brent Crosland	Range Technician	Solid and hazardous waste, woodland/forestry
George Cruz	Natural Resource Specialist	Hydrology Floodplains, geology, mineral resources, energy production
Teresa Frampton	Realty Specialist	Project management, lands, access
Justin Johnson	Fire Management Specialist	Fuels, fire management
Jerry Mansfield	Geologist	Paleontology
Joelle McCarthy	Archaeologist	Cultural resources, Native American religious concerns
James Priest	Wildlife Biologist	Fish and wildlife including special status species other than FWS candidate or listed species; e.g., migratory birds; threatened, endangered or candidate wildlife species
R.B. Probert	Weeds Specialist	Invasive species and noxious weeds

TABLE 5-2 BLM PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	Title	Involvement
Erin Rajala	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, wilderness, wilderness characteristics, visual resources, wild and scenic rivers, ACECs
Matt Rajala	Natural Resource Specialist	Air quality, environmental justice, farmlands (Prime and Unique), soils, socioeconomics, NEPA coordination
Eric Reid	Rangeland Management Specialist	Wild horses and burros
Bill Thompson	Rangeland Management Specialist	Livestock grazing, range management, wetland/riparian zones
David Whitaker	Rangeland Management Specialist	Threatened, endangered, or candidate plant species; vegetation including special status plant species other than FWS candidate or listed species
Utah BLM State Office		
Tyler Ashcroft	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	NEPA compliance review
Rob Sweeten	Visual Resource Program Lead	Visual resources
Project Management		
Tamara Gertsch	National Project Manager	Project management

TABLE 5-3 USFS PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	Title	Involvement
Fishlake National Forest		
Kevin Draper	Recreation Specialist, Landscape Architect	Visual resources
Michael D. Smith	Soil Scientist	Soils
Kathy Twitchell	Realty Specialist	Project coordination
Dixie National Forest		
Rick Dustin	Landscape Architect	Visual resources
Marian Jacklin	Archaeologist	Cultural resources
Jenna Jorgensen	Biologist	Biological Resources
Gretchen Merrill	Public Service Group Officer	Project management
Kathy Slack	Realty Specialist	Project coordination
TEAMS		
Mike Fracasso	Paleontologist	Paleontological resources
Chad Hermandorfer	Hydrologist	Water resources
Janel McCurdy	TEAMS Lead	Project management
Chris Mease	Fisheries Biologist	Biological resources
Terry Miller	Botanist	Biological resources
Lucretia Smith	GIS Specialist	GIS and rangeland

TABLE 5-4 CONSULTANT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	Education	Involvement
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING GROUP (EPG)		
Keith Albury	MA, Geography BA, Natural Science	GIS
Louise Brown	BS, Administrative Systems	Document management/technical editor
Jennifer Christiansen	MS, Geography BS, Geography	GIS
Kelleigh Cole	MA, Anthropology BA, Communications	Public involvement
Joe Donaldson	MLA, Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning BLA, Landscape Architecture	Senior technical review, land use
Michael Doyle	MLA, Landscape Architecture BS, Environmental Design	Principal-in-Charge
Chris Gaughan	MS, Wildlife Conservation BS, Earth Science	Wildlife and fisheries biology and vegetation resources, water resources
Naia George	MS, Anthropology BS, Anthropology	Cultural and historical resources
Angie Green	BA, English	Document management/technical editor
Emily Hadlock	BS, History	GIS
Heather Hedden	BA, Biology	Wildlife biology and vegetation resources, water resources
Gena Huffman	MS, Anthropology BA, Political Science and Anthropology	Cultural and historical resources
Michael Kirby, PhD	PhD, Geology MS, Geology BS, Geology	Earth and water resources, paleontology
Jonathan Knight	BS, Geography	GIS
Mike McConnell	BS, Wildlife Resources	Water resources, wildlife and fisheries biology
Amanda O'Connor	MS, Conservation Studies BA, Environmental Biology	Senior technical review, NEPA coordination
Mike Pasenko	MS, Quaternary Sciences Program BA, Anthropology	Earth and water resources, paleontology
Reid Persing	BA, Chemistry and Biochemistry	Vegetation resources, wildlife biology
Justin M. Peterson	BS, Urban Planning	Land use and recreation, project coordinator
Kevin Rauhe	BLA, Landscape Architecture	Visual resources
Rhianna Riggs	BS, Mass Communications/Public Relations	Public involvement
Matt Sauter	MS, Paleontology BA, Geology	Earth and water resources, paleontology
Marc Schwartz	BS, Forestry/Ecosystem Management	Visual resources
Cindy Smith	BS, Liberal Arts and Sciences	Project manager
Linwood Smith, PhD	PhD, Zoology MS, Zoology BA, Zoology	Wildlife biology and vegetation resources
Marty Thomas	BA, English BA, Anthropology	Cultural and historical resources

TABLE 5-4 CONSULTANT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		
Name	Education	Involvement
Bobby Tuttle	MS, Biology BS, Urban and Regional Planning (minor in Biology)	Wildlife biology and vegetation resources
Heather Weymouth	MS, American Studies (Anthropology) BIS, Anthropology	Cultural and historical resources
SUBCONSULTANTS		
Louis Berger Group		
Lisa McDonald, PhD	PhD, Mineral Economics MS, Mineral Economics BS, Earth Science	Socioeconomics and environmental justice
Wind River Environmental Group, LLC		
Martha Hyder, PhD	PhD, Earth Science/Bioclimateology MS, Earth Science/Bioclimateology BS, Biology	Air quality and Clean Air Act conformity analysis
Exponent		
Joshua Phinney, PhD	PhD, Electrical Engineering SM, Electrical Engineering BS, Electrical Engineering	Electric and magnetic fields, noise