

CHAPTER 5.
CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 Introduction

CEQ regulations implementing NEPA require that federal agencies provide meaningful opportunities for the public and stakeholders to provide input and identify their concerns with regard to the EIS process. Federal laws, such as the ESA, the CWA, and the NHPA, mandate public involvement and consultation with agencies or federally recognized tribal governments.

This chapter documents the specific consultation and coordination efforts undertaken by the BLM throughout the entire process of developing the SSEP draft EIS. A complete list of agencies and individuals who received the draft EIS can be found in the administrative record.

5.2 Public Involvement

The BLM has taken a variety of steps to inform the public; special interest groups; and local, state, and federal agencies about the Proposed Action and alternatives for the SSEP, and to solicit feedback from these interested parties to help shape the scope and alternatives of this project. The following sections summarize the efforts taken to consult and coordinate with all interested persons, agencies, tribes, and organizations.

5.2.1 Public Scoping Meetings

As part of the NEPA requirements, a NOI to prepare the EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on July 8, 2009. Publication of the NOI initiated a 60-day, formal public and agency scoping period, during which the BLM solicited comments regarding the project and regarding its potential impacts.

Early in the scoping period, the BLM advertised the initiation of the EIS process through the BLM website, advertisements in the local newspapers, media releases, and direct mailings to 844 past project stakeholders, SSEP Project Area stakeholders, and special interest groups (environmental, elected officials, business interests, recreational, and tribal). Additionally, personal telephone calls were made to key stakeholders to provide project and scoping meeting information, and public meeting information was posted at various community outlets, such as community centers, libraries, grocery stores, city offices, and recreational outlets in Avondale, Goodyear, Buckeye, and Gila Bend. Public briefings were held with a variety of interest groups, agencies, etc. to inform them about the project. Table 5.1 includes a list of meetings that took place, the topics discussed, and meeting attendees.

Table 5.1 List of Meetings and Telephone Conversations, Meeting Topics, and Meeting Attendees –
Scoping and Development of the Draft EIS

Date	Agency/Group	Discussion/Topic	BLM Attendees
April 24, 2009	BLM Arizona State Office	Discussion with the Governor's Office and industry representatives on BLM's strategy for processing solar <u>ROW</u> applications	Jim Kenna, Mike Taylor, Julie Decker, Joe Incardine, Kathleen Depukat, Solar Core Team
May 15, 2009	ADWR	Project overview	Joe Incardine, Julie Decker, Kathleen Depukat
May 19, 2009	Arizona Corporation Commission	Project overview <u>and</u> permitting	Joe Incardine
June 10, 2009	AZGFD	Project introduction and invitation to cooperate	Joe Incardine
July 14, 2009	Abengoa Solar	Project discussion with Kate Maracas	Joe Incardine
July 14, 2009	APS Lands Department	Project discussion with Ryan Jagels	Joe Incardine
July 15, 2009	<u>EPA</u>	Project discussion with Ann McPherson	Joe Incardine
July 23, 2009	Arizona Desert Bighorn Sheep Society	Project discussion with Brian Dolan	Joe Incardine
July 27, 2009	City of Goodyear	Project introduction with Joe Schmitz	Joe Incardine
July 27, 2009	APS	Project discussion with Ryan Jagels	Joe Incardine
July 30, 2009	ADEQ	Project overview with Paul Rasmussen	Joe Incardine
September 16, 2009	ADOT	Project discussion relating to traffic with Thor Anderson	Joe Incardine
September 17, 2009	ADEQ	Project and permitting discussion with David Lelsz	Joe Incardine
October 15, 2009	National Renewal Energy Laboratory	Project discussion on technology with Doug Dahle	Joe Incardine
November 4, 2009	ADEQ – Water Quality Division	Project discussion on permitting with David Lelsz, Linda Taunt, Carolette Winstead, Wendy Lestarge	Joe Incardine
December 22, 2009	Town of Buckeye	Project overview and EIS process	Joe Incardine, Emily Garber
January 31, 2010	City of Goodyear	Groundwater modeling	Joe Incardine, Jim Renthal
February 2, 2010	<u>ADWR</u> , City of Goodyear	Groundwater permitting	Joe Incardine, Jim Renthal
February 10, 2010	<u>AZGFD</u> , Sonoran Institute, The Wilderness Society, Friends of the Sonoran Desert Monument, The Sierra Club	<u>AZGFD</u> mitigation proposals	Joe Incardine, Tim Hughes

Table 5.1 List of Meetings and Telephone Conversations, Meeting Topics, and Meeting Attendees –
Scoping and Development of the Draft EIS

Date	Agency/Group	Discussion/Topic	BLM Attendees
February 11, 2010	Town of Buckeye	Project overview and jurisdictional permitting	Joe Incardine, Emily Garber
February 16, 2010	SRP	Project discussion on technology with Dan Brickley, Mark Russell, Sr., Brian Keel, Luke O'Dwyer, Chuck Russell, Mark Russell, and Chuck Falls	Emily Garber, Kathleen Depukat, Chris Horyza, Eddie Arreola, Joe Incardine, Melissa Warren
March 23, 2010	BLM	Stormwater drainage	Kathleen Depukat, Terresa Reed, Julie Decker, Jim Renthall

The BLM held public and agency scoping meetings for the EIS in Phoenix, Arizona, on August 4, 2009, and public scoping meetings in Buckeye and Gila Bend, Arizona, on August 5 and 6, 2009, respectively. At each meeting, BLM, Boulevard, and project contractor staff members were on hand to provide information on project planning activities to date, and to answer questions. Meeting attendees were encouraged to provide written comments on the issues and alternatives to be analyzed in the EIS.

5.2.2 Scoping Report

A detailed description of the scoping process, planning issues derived from the comments, and analysis of the information received is contained in the BLM's October 2009 scoping report. The scoping report is available at the BLM LSFO or online at http://www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/energy/solar/sonoran_solar.html. The BLM received 93 scoping letters from individuals and businesses; federal, state, and local agencies; and nongovernmental organizations. Informal comments captured through the public scoping meeting notes were also included in the scoping report.

5.2.3 Meetings on the Draft EIS

As part of the NEPA requirements, NOAs of the draft EIS were published in the *Federal Register* by the EPA on April 9, 2010, and by the BLM on April 19, 2010. Publication of the EPA NOA initiated a 45-day, formal, public and agency comment period, during which the BLM solicited comments regarding the project, the alternatives analyzed, and potential environmental impacts.

Early in the comment period, the BLM advertised the publication of the draft EIS through the BLM website, advertisements in the local newspapers, media releases, and direct mailings to 850 past project stakeholders, SSEP Project Area stakeholders, special interest groups (environmental, elected officials, business interests, recreational, and tribal), and individuals who signed up for the mailing list at the scoping meetings or by other means. Additionally, personal telephone calls were made to key stakeholders to provide project information, and public meeting information was posted at various community outlets, such as community centers, libraries, grocery stores, city offices, and recreational outlets in Avondale, Goodyear, Buckeye, and Gila Bend. Table 5.2 provides a list of meetings that took place, the topics discussed, and meeting attendees.

Table 5.2 List of Meetings and Telephone Conversations, Meeting Topics, and Meeting Attendees – Public Comment Period on the Draft EIS

<u>Date</u>	<u>Agency/Group</u>	<u>Discussion/Topic</u>	<u>BLM Attendees</u>
<u>April 2, 2010</u>	<u>BLM</u>	<u>Off-site air mitigation</u>	<u>Joe Incardine, Kathleen Depukat, Jim Renthal, Craig Nicholls, Scott Archer</u>
<u>April 20, 2010</u>	<u>BLM</u>	<u>Cultural resources and Section 106</u>	<u>Joe Incardine, Kathleen Depukat, Mike Johnson</u>
<u>April 26, 2010</u>	<u>Town of Buckeye</u>	<u>Draft EIS and water usage</u>	<u>Joe Incardine, Emily Garber</u>
<u>May 18, 2010</u>	<u>Town of Buckeye</u>	<u>MOU and draft EIS</u>	<u>Joe Incardine, Emily Garber</u>
<u>May 19, 2010</u>	<u>BLM</u>	<u>Identification of key decision points based on preliminary review of draft EIS comments.</u>	<u>Joe Incardine, Kathleen Depukat, Angelita Bullets, Emily Garber, Chris Horyza</u>
<u>May 20, 2010</u>	<u>AZGFD</u>	<u>Relocation of kit fox/badgers/burrowing owls</u>	<u>Joe Incardine, Tim Hughes</u>
<u>May 25, 2010</u>	<u>Wild at Heart</u>	<u>Relocation of burrowing owls</u>	<u>Joe Incardine, Tim Hughes, Kathleen Depukat</u>
<u>May 25, 2010</u>	<u>EPA</u>	<u>Draft EIS comments</u>	<u>Joe Incardine</u>
<u>May 28, 2010</u>	<u>Arizona Corporation Commission</u>	<u>Draft EIS comments</u>	<u>Joe Incardine</u>

A digital copy and/or hard copy of the draft EIS was mailed to 202 individuals, including federal key project stakeholders and those who responded to the direct mailings indicating that they wanted a copy. A hard copy of the draft EIS was made available for inspection at the BLM LSFO and public libraries in Buckeye, Gila Bend, and Goodyear, Arizona. A digital copy of the draft EIS was made available on the BLM's website.

The BLM held agency and public meetings to discuss the draft EIS in Phoenix, Arizona, on April 27, 2010, and public meetings in Gila Bend and Buckeye, Arizona, on April 28 and 29, 2011, respectively. At each meeting, BLM, Boulevard, and project contractor staff members were on hand to provide information on project planning activities to date, and to answer questions regarding the content of the draft EIS. Meeting attendees were encouraged to provide written comments on the issues and alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS.

5.2.4 Project Newsletter

On May 16, 2011, a project newsletter was sent to 748 past project stakeholders, SSEP Project Area stakeholders, special interest groups (environmental, elected officials, business interests, recreation, and tribal), and individuals who signed up for the mailing list at the public meetings or by other means. The newsletter contained an overview of the Proposed Action, the alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, and the addition of PV technology as a sub-alternative (Sub-alternative A1) for further study. The newsletter was presented at the May 4, 2011, Resource Advisory Council meeting prior to being distributed to the entities indicated above.

5.2.5 Responding to Comments on the Draft EIS

The BLM received a total of 161 comment letters on the draft EIS, as follows:

- 83 form letters sent by individuals using a letter generator originating from the Sierra Club (a nongovernmental organization)
- Two "form-plus letters," that is, a copy of the form letter described above, with additional text added
- 76 unique letters

Letters were received through submissions via the BLM webform, public meeting comment cards, letters, and emails. The 76 unique letters were from the following entities:

- Seven submissions from businesses, including one submission from the project proponent, Boulevard
- Three submissions from eight nongovernmental organizations (Wildlife Society, Western Lands Project, and a letter from the Wilderness Society's BLM Action Center sent on behalf of the Wilderness Society, Sierra Club-Grand Canyon Chapter, Friends of the Sonoran Desert Museum, Sonoran Institute, Tonopah Area Coalition, and Defenders of Wildlife)
- Seven submissions from federal agencies (Prescott National Forest, U.S. Senator Jon Kyl, BLM Phoenix District Office; and four submissions from the EPA)
- Seven submissions from State of Arizona agencies (one submission each from the AZGFD, ADWR, ADOT, and ADEQ Water Division; and three submissions from ADEQ's Air Quality Division)
- Seven submissions from regional and local entities (one submission each from the Maricopa County Association of Governments and the Maricopa County Parks and Recreation, two submissions from the City of Goodyear, and three submissions from the Town of Buckeye)
- Two tribal submissions (the Hopi Tribe and the Tohono O'odham Nation)
- 43 individual submissions (not including the two "form-plus" submissions)

In preparing the final EIS, the BLM considered all comments to the extent practicable. Appendix A (Response to Comments) contains each unique comment received and its associated response. The appendix also contains a description of the comment analysis and response process.

5.2.6 Public Comment Period on the Final EIS

There will be a 30-day review and comment period on the final EIS. Any written comments received during this period will be considered prior to the ROD.

5.3 Agency Coordination/Consultation

5.3.1 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Section 7 of the ESA requires federal agencies to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction of their designated critical habitat. It also requires consultation with the USFWS in making that determination.

The BLM initiated informal consultation with the USFWS under Section 7(a) (2) of the ESA on July 8, 2009, requesting from the Arizona Ecological Services Field Office of the USFWS a list of endangered or threatened species (or species proposed for listing) that may occur in the Project Area or be affected by SSEP construction. The list was provided by the USFWS in a letter dated August 11, 2009.

A BA was prepared to determine if the development and/or operation of the SSEP would have any effects on species included in the list provided by the USFWS. The BA was submitted to the USFWS on December 8, 2009. The USFWS responded on January 11, 2010, issuing its concurrence that no adverse effects are likely to occur to the species listed and indicating that no further consultation with the USFWS would be required at this time. In its concurrence letter, the USFWS recommended that a groundwater monitoring plan be established and implemented to track and confirm that the SSEP would have no unanticipated effects on the Gila River. Copies of the August 11, 2009₂ species list letter and the January 11, 2010₂ concurrence letter are included in Appendix B (Consultation Letters).

5.3.2 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The USACE was contacted on September 4, 2009₂ for an approved Department of the Army JD for the Project Area. Clarification was requested from the USACE on whether the SSEP would require a Section 404 permit under the CWA. Section 404 regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands and other special aquatic sites. The USACE indicated that the Project Area does not contain any waters of the United States, and thus no Section 404 permit would be required for the discharge of dredged or fill material associated with the SSEP. The USACE's formal responses to both determinations are contained as separate letters in Appendix B.

5.3.3 Cooperating Agency Involvement

In July 2009₂ the BLM invited 20 federal, state, and local entities to participate in the project as cooperating agencies. To date, cooperating agency status has been extended to the Town of Buckeye, City of Goodyear, and AZGFD. MOUs outlining the roles and responsibilities of each agency in preparation of the EIS have been prepared. The USACE initially accepted the cooperating agency invitation, but upon determination that the Project Area did not contain any waters of the United States and would not require a Section 404 permit, they notified SSEP project managers that there was no longer a need for them to be a cooperating agency for the project. The BLM informally engaged the ADWR throughout preparation of the draft EIS for guidance on State of Arizona permitting requirements and input on the development of the NEPA analysis. The ADWR became a formal cooperating agency in March 2011 (following issuance of the draft EIS and prior to publication of this final EIS).

5.3.4 Arizona Game and Fish Department

Throughout project planning, Boulevard consulted with AZGFD regarding potential impacts to wildlife species that are not threatened or endangered but that are of interest to AZGFD. AZGFD initially provided Boulevard with two research proposals that would be considered mitigation for impacts to wildlife. They also provided a third proposal to conduct pre-construction wildlife clearance surveys for various species. Boulevard and AZGFD are finalizing discussions regarding research proposals and mitigation, with Boulevard supporting the AZGFD proposed wildlife clearance surveys. The anticipated outcome of these discussions is an MOU outlining the agreed-upon actions and funding. The finalized MOU will be provided to BLM when agreement is reached between Boulevard and AZGDF, and may be attached to the ROD.

Additionally, AZGFD's initial proposals were provided to both BLM and interested local environmental organizations (Sierra Club, Sonoran Institute, Friends of the Sonoran Desert National Monument, etc.) for input and feedback. BLM has also been apprised of the most recent discussions and proposals provided by AZGFD, which specifically address Sub-alternative A1.

5.4 Government-to-government Consultation

The BLM is engaged in formal, government-to-government consultation with several federally recognized tribes with interest in the SSEP. Consultation with tribes is required under Section 106 of the NHPA, as well as NEPA and other laws and EOs. Section 106 of the NHPA requires that federal agencies consider the effects of their actions on historic properties, following regulations in 36 CFR § 800. Agencies must also consider effects on places of traditional cultural and religious importance. Historic properties under the NHPA are cultural resources that are included in the NRHP or that meet the criteria for the NRHP. Section 106 of the NHPA requires that federal agencies consult with the appropriate SHPO and Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) if they (the federal agencies) determine that activities under their control could affect historic properties. Under NHPA, any adverse effects to NRHP-eligible properties are to be resolved through consultations that identify appropriate mitigation and treatment measures.

The BLM formally initiated Section 106 consultation with the Arizona SHPO on October 1, 2009. In its initiation letter, the BLM identified the APE and clarified that a Class III cultural resources survey of the entire APE would be conducted. A copy of this correspondence is included in Appendix B. The BLM accepted the Class III cultural resources survey. Both the report and BLM's recommendations of eligibility were forwarded to the SHPO for further consultation in February 2010. By letter dated March 22, 2010, SHPO concurred with the BLM's determination that three archaeological sites in the APE are eligible for the NRHP. A letter dated April 11, 2011, was sent to the SHPO updating them on the addition of Sub-alternative A1 for detailed analysis in the final EIS, and recommending a determination of adverse effect. The SHPO responded by a letter dated April 29, 2011, reiterating the eligibility of the three sites, concurring with the adverse effect determination and recommending a memorandum of agreement (MOA) and data recovery plan to resolve the direct adverse effect on the unavoidable site, with monitoring of the two sites to be avoided by construction and operations. . The SHPO provided comments on a draft version of the MOA on August 22, 2011. The BLM is working with the SHPO and other consulting parties to finalize the MOA and a historic properties treatment plan that will address procedures for data recovery, monitoring, and unanticipated discoveries. As required, a notification of adverse effect determination was sent to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on July 20, 2011, inviting the council to participate in development of the MOA. The ACHP responded on August 5, 2011, and declined to participate as a formal signatory to the MOA.

The BLM initiated formal consultation with tribes through consultation letters sent on July 7, 2009, to the following eight federally recognized tribes: Ak Chin Indian Community, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, Gila River Indian Community, Hopi Tribe, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Tohono O'odham Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. The Hopi Tribe responded in writing, requesting a copy of the cultural resources survey and indicating that they would continue formal consultation if any prehistoric cultural resources would be adversely affected by the project. A copy of the Hopi Tribe letter is included in Appendix B. In February 2010, the tribes were provided copies of the survey report and draft EIS for review and comment. A letter dated April 11, 2011, was sent to the tribes updating them on the addition of Sub-alternative A1 for detailed analysis in the final EIS, reviewing determinations of eligibility (with which several tribes had concurred), and addressing a proposed determination of adverse effect. Responses were received from the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, and the Gila River Indian Community. A letter

requesting tribal participation in the MOA was sent to the tribes on July 12, 2011, with a copy of a preliminary draft MOA. Tribal consultations will continue through the development and implementation of the MOA and a historic properties treatment plan (which will include a data recovery plan).

5.4.1 Specific Consultation Actions

The BLM initiated government-to-government consultation with eight federally recognized Indian tribes (listed in Section 5.4) beginning in July 2009. Consultation is ongoing and has taken place through letters, telephone calls, face-to-face meetings, and electronic mail. Six tribes responded and requested continuing consultations and opportunities to review documents and matters relating to cultural resources. The Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation stated that it had no issues and would defer participation to the Gila River and Ak-Chin communities. Despite follow-up contacts from the BLM, no response was received from the Pascua Yaqui Tribe.

Major correspondence included the following letters to tribal officials and staff:

- July 2009: Initial formal consultation letter with project description and offer of meetings or a tour.
- February 2010: Class III survey report with preliminary NRHP eligibility determinations provided to tribes for review and comment.
- April 2010: Draft EIS provided to tribes with request for review and comment.
- April 2011: Following a hiatus in the project schedule, the BLM updated the tribes on the addition of the PV sub-alternative, eligibility determinations, and the likelihood of an adverse effect determination with potential mitigation measures of data recovery, avoidance, and monitoring. Tribal responses concurred with the eligibility and effect determinations.
- August 2011: Tribes were provided a copy of the draft MOA for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community responded that its legal department was reviewing the document. The Hopi Tribe declined the invitation to be a formal concurring party to the MOA but requested the continued opportunity to review any treatment or data recovery plans.

BLM staff and managers presented information and responded to questions at four meetings of the Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resource Group, which consists of staff and representatives from the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Ak Chin Indian Community, and the Tohono O'odham Nation. These meetings took place in July 2009, March 2010, March 2011, and August 2011. The Phoenix District manager and Lower Sonoran Field Office manager attended meetings held in 2011. BLM managers also discussed the project proposal with a representative of the Tohono O'odham Nation at a public scoping meeting in August 2009.

Government-to-government consultation has not revealed any significant sources of controversy regarding cultural resources or tribal concerns with the proposed undertaking. The THPO of the Tohono O'odham Nation stated that it is inappropriate to site a solar energy project near two wilderness areas and a national monument. Tribes have not identified any significant traditional places or sacred sites within the proposed Project Area. In its comments on the draft EIS, the Tohono O'odham Nation noted that no "cultural landscape study" was completed but did not offer relevant information. In response, the BLM will require that any proposed data recovery plan developed as mitigation, even if focused on a single site, will incorporate a research design that places the site within the larger context of cultural landscape use. Tribes will be offered the opportunity to contribute to this aspect of the data recovery study. Continuing consultation will provide an open forum for tribes to remain involved and to voice any evolving concerns.

5.5 Recipients of this EIS

Pursuant to CEQ regulations (40 CFR § 1502.19), the BLM is circulating this final EIS to 1) agencies having jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved and any appropriate federal, state or local agency authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards; 2) the applicant; and 3) any agencies, organizations, or individuals requesting a copy of the document.

The SSEP EIS distribution list was developed from the stakeholders lists compiled prior to and during the scoping process and then supplemented throughout the planning process. Those interested in receiving project updates were able to indicate their interest on public meeting comment forms and project mailers, or submit their information to Joe Incardine via email, telephone, fax, or writing. A complete list of all recipients of the draft and final EISs can be found in the administrative record.

5.6 List of Preparers

The SSEP EIS was written by a team composed of BLM and third-party-contractor personnel. Under direction of the BLM, the consulting team prepared alternatives, collected data for the analysis, assessed potential effects of the alternatives, and prepared other chapters with additional comment and critique from the cooperating agencies. The BLM has approved the content of this EIS. Table 5.3 identifies the agencies and individuals involved with the preparation and review of this EIS.

Table 5.3 List of Preparers

Entity		Responsibility	Title	Years of Experience
BLM				
Andersen	Jim	Lands Use/Access	Lead Realty Specialist	32
Applegate	Don	Recreation	Recreation Program Leader	30
Bickauskas	Tom	Travel Management	Travel Management Coordinator	9
<u>Depukat</u>	<u>Kathleen</u>	<u>Project Management</u>	<u>Phoenix District Project Manager</u>	<u>23</u>
Gibson	William	Travel Management	Travel Management Coordinator	30
<u>Grove</u>	<u>Kevin</u>	<u>Wildlife Resources</u>	<u>Wildlife Biologist</u>	<u>13</u>
Harris, Ph.D.	William	Hazardous Materials	HAZMAT/AML Coordinator	30
Horyza	Chris	Environmental Justice, Social Economics, NEPA Compliance	NEPA Coordinator	31
Hughes	Tim	Wildlife Resources	Wildlife Biologist	24
Incardine	Joe	Project Management	National Project Manager	30
Johnson	Michael	Cultural Resources, Section 106 Consultation, Paleontology	Deputy Preservation Officer	26
Mahoney	Ken	Wilderness, National Monuments, Special Designations	National Landscape Conservation System Coordinator	32
Masters	Elroy	Vegetation Resources	Biologist	18
Mogel	Angela	Lands Use/Access	Lead Realty Specialist	28
<u>Nicholls</u>	<u>Craig</u>	<u>Air Quality</u>	<u>National Air Quality Modeler</u>	<u>21</u>
Ragsdale	Jack	Recreation, Visual Resources	Recreation Planner	30

Table 5.3 List of Preparers

Entity		Responsibility	Title	Years of Experience
Renthal	Jim	Air Quality, Climate, Water Resources, Drainage, Geology/Minerals/Soils	Natural Resources Specialist	33
<u>Stone</u>	<u>Connie</u>	<u>Cultural Resources, Section 106 Consultation</u>	<u>Renewable Energy Coordination Office Archaeologist</u>	<u>34</u>
Warren	Melissa	Lands and Realty	Realty Specialist	10
Logan Simpson				
Higgins	Patrick	Noise	NEPA Coordinator	41
SWCA				
Bellavia	Cara	Technical Resource Lead	Planning Specialist	13
Burch Vernon	Laura	Socioeconomics, Paleontology	Planning Specialist, AICP	9
Childs	Amanda	Geology/Minerals, Soils, Hazardous Materials	Planning Specialist	14
Christensen	Amanda	Wildlife	Planning Specialist	8
Christensen	John	Water/Drainage	Planning Specialist, P.G.	27
Connell	Jeff	Technical Resource Lead	Planning Specialist	31
Gaddis	Ben	Assistant Project Manager, NEPA Compliance	Planning Specialist	12
Gaddis	Erica	Air Quality, <u>Water quality</u>	Planning Specialist, Ph.D.	6
Hornbeck	Hope	Vegetation Resources	Planning Specialist	8
Hornung	Elisha	Public Involvement	Planning Specialist	10
Hultgren	Andy	Climate	Planning Specialist	8
Knox	Steve	Project Manager, NEPA Compliance	NEPA Specialist	35
Larson	Greg	Project Manager, EIS Writing Team Lead	Planning Specialist	7
Leslie	Steve	Noise, Visual Resources	Planning Specialist	13
Orcutt-Gachiri	Heidi	Technical Editing	Technical Editor	13
Rausch	Ryan	Transportation and Access	Planning Specialist	6
Reber	Deb	Land Use, Recreation, Special Designations, Livestock	Planning Specialist	22
Tremblay	Adrienne	Cultural Resources	Planning Specialist	5
Tucker_Burfitt	Linda	Technical Editing, Formatting, <u>Publication</u>	<u>Lead</u> Technical Editor	8
<u>Smith</u>	<u>Debbi</u>	<u>Formatting, Publication</u>	<u>Formatting/Production Coordinator</u>	<u>8</u>
EPG and Subconsultants				
Carr	David	Water (groundwater) Technical Report	Senior Consultant/Hydrogeologist	28
Duncan	Kevin	Transportation, Land Use, and Recreation Technical Report	Regional Manager and Senior Environmental Planner	8
Farmer	Bob	Air Quality Technical Report, Hazardous Materials Technical Report	Program Director, Air Quality Services	25
Kirby	Michael	Paleontology Technical Report,	Director of Earth Sciences	20

Table 5.3 List of Preparers

Entity		Responsibility	Title	Years of Experience
		Geology/Minerals/Soils Technical Report		
Mantey	Bob	Noise Technical Report	Principal Noise Consultant	30
McDonald	Lisa	Health and Safety, Socioeconomics Technical Report	Senior Economist	17
Moody	Jack	Drainage Technical Report (draft), Water (surface) Technical Report	Director of Water Resources	26
Schwartz	Marc	Visual Technical Report, Visual Simulations	Director of Visual Resources	10
Shelley	Steven	Cultural Resources Technical Report	Director of Cultural Resources	20
Smigielski	Andrew	Traffic	Principal and Senior Traffic Engineer	17
Smith	Linwood	Biological Assessment, Biology (wildlife and vegetation) Technical Report	Director of Biological Resource Services	36

This page intentionally blank