6.0 Consultation and Coordination

This EIS was conducted in accordance with NEPA requirements, CEQ regulations, and the USDOI and BLM policies and procedures for implementing NEPA. NEPA and the associated laws, regulations, and policies require BLM and Western to seek public input and initiate agency consultation early and throughout the planning process to identify issues and develop a reasonable range of alternatives to ensure that environmental documents appropriately disclose the potential impacts of alternatives considered. Public involvement and agency consultation and coordination, which are at the heart of the process leading to this EIS, were achieved through Federal Register notices, public and informal meetings, individual contacts, media releases, and the Project website.

TransWest and Western are proposing to construct, own, and operate the TWE Project, which would be an EHV DC transmission system that stretches from south-central Wyoming to southern Nevada. Given the distance spanned, public involvement in this Project is critical to the success of the NEPA process. This chapter outlines the consultation and the coordination process for the proposed Project, including the general public as well as Tribal governments, and federal, state, and local agencies and organizations.

6.1 Public Involvement and Scoping

6.1.1 Public Involvement

NEPA requires full disclosure and open public participation in the federal decision making process, including those projects proposed by non-federal proponents that require federal approval. There are two key points during the development of an EIS that the general public is invited to participate in the process: 1) during the scoping period, and 2) during the 90-day public comment period of the Draft EIS.

The BLM and Western accepted written comments throughout all stages of Project development. Summaries of the public comments received during scoping are included in the Scoping Report (BLM and Western 2011), and are available online on the BLM webpage (http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/hdd/transwest.html). The issues and concerns identified by the public during the scoping period are summarized in Section 1.8 of the Scoping Report.

The release of this Draft EIS will be followed by a 90-day public comment period. Comments received will be reviewed and substantive comments will receive a response. Substantive comments and corresponding responses will be provided as an appendix to the Final EIS. Comments will be used to modify, clarify, and/or correct the Final EIS as appropriate.

6.1.2 Scoping Period

The following sections describe the pre-scoping and scoping process following TWE's amended 2010 ROW application submission and the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register on January 4, 2011.

The BLM and Western conducted pre-scoping activities following the January 2010 SF 299 ROW application submittal. During the spring of 2010, comments were received from the interdisciplinary team, BLM FOs, Forest Service, and the Cooperating Agencies. These comments were considered in developing the alternative corridors presented to the public during the scoping period.

In addition to the brief summary of scoping found in Section 1.7, this section describes the public scoping process, including techniques used to notify the public about the opportunity to comment at this stage in the NEPA process.

6.1.3 Scoping Announcements

The initial step in the NEPA process is to notify the public, other government agencies, and tribes of the lead agency's intent to prepare an EIS. The scoping period was announced using a variety of tools:

- ***Federal Register*** – The BLM published the NOI in the Federal Register on January 4, 2011.
- **Newsletters** – a TWE Project newsletter was mailed to approximately 23,000 interested parties including federal, state, and local agencies, and tribes as well as potentially affected landowners within the proposed 2-mile-wide corridors for the proposed and alternative routes.
- **Advertisements** – BLM- and Western-placed display advertisements in local newspapers, and Public Service Announcements (PSAs) were submitted for broadcast on local radio and television announcing the public meetings.
- **Media Releases** – BLM Public Affairs personnel from each of the BLM field offices (FOs) were contacted as a part of the Media Plan to identify the appropriate media outlets and optimum time for conducting a public meeting in their area. The information was compiled and used to schedule the public scoping meetings and media placement for notification.
- **Public Libraries** – The BLM compiled materials and information presented at the scoping meetings into a three-ring binder and distributed it on January 21, 2011 to 23 public libraries located in communities where scoping meetings would be held for public access and review.
- **BLM TransWest Express Transmission Project Web Site** – The BLM established a Project website for the proposed Project. The website was initially used to notify the public of the scoping meetings, provide general Project overview information, as well as information to provide comments to the BLM regarding the proposed Project. The website currently serves as the electronic NEPA-related Project information source for all aspects and stages of the Project's NEPA process.

6.1.3.1 Scoping Meetings

Public scoping meetings offer an opportunity for the public to participate in the Project during the scoping period. The meetings promote information exchange about the proposed Project and to gather public input. The BLM and Western hosted 23 public scoping meetings throughout the Project area with a total attendance of 678 individuals. These meetings were conducted as informal open houses to allow for an open exchange of information and to provide the attendees the opportunity to ask agency personnel, the Project Applicant, and EIS contractor questions about the Project. Once attendees signed in to record their attendance, they were invited to review information about the project and the NEPA process at seven information stations. A list of meeting dates, locations, and attendance is listed below (**Table 6-1**).

Table 6-1 Public Scoping Meeting Dates and Locations

Meeting Location	Meeting Date
Vernal, Utah	Tuesday, January 25, 2011
Craig, Colorado	Wednesday, January 26, 2011
Rangely, Colorado	Thursday, January 27, 2011
Grand Junction, Colorado	Monday, January 31, 2011
Moab, Utah	Tuesday, February 1, 2011
Castle Dale, Utah	Wednesday, February 2, 2011
Duchesne, Utah	Monday, February 7, 2011
Nephi, Utah	Tuesday, February 8, 2011

Table 6-1 Public Scoping Meeting Dates and Locations

Meeting Location	Meeting Date
Delta, Utah	Wednesday, February 9, 2011
Richfield, Utah	Monday, February 14, 2011
Milford, Utah	Tuesday, February 15, 2011
Cedar City, Utah	Wednesday, February 16, 2011
St. George, Utah	Thursday, February 17, 2011
Pine Valley, Utah	Tuesday, February 22, 2011
Central, Utah	Wednesday, February 23, 2011
Enterprise, Utah	Thursday, February 24, 2011
Caliente, Nevada	Monday, February 28, 2011
Overton (Moapa Valley), Nevada	Tuesday, March 1, 2011
Henderson, Nevada	Wednesday, March 2, 2011
Las Vegas, Nevada	Thursday, March 3, 2011
Rawlins, Wyoming	Tuesday, March 8, 2011
Rock Springs, Wyoming	Wednesday, March 9, 2011
Baggs, Wyoming	Thursday, March 10, 2011

During the scoping period, BLM and Western met with representatives of several County Commissions. The meetings were scheduled to coincide with the scoping meeting in their respective county. The meetings provided Project information and explained the EIS process. Packets containing the materials available to the public at the scoping meetings were distributed to the Commissioners. In addition to the County Commissioners, BLM and Western met with the Clark County, Nevada, Conservation Program on March 1, 2011.

6.1.3.2 Scoping Comments

The BLM and Western received a total of 622 comment submittals (e.g., letter, comment form, email) containing 2,319 individual comments during the public scoping period. These comments were electronically submitted at the GIS comment station at the meetings, through the BLM Project website, or by U.S. Mail. Following the close of the public scoping period, comments were compiled and analyzed to identify issues and concerns. Within each comment submittal, individual comments were identified, reviewed, and entered into an electronic database.

6.2 Agency Participation and Coordination

Specific regulations require the BLM to coordinate and consult with federal, state, and local agencies about the potential of the proposed Project and alternatives to affect sensitive environmental and human resources. The BLM initiated these coordination and consultation activities through the scoping process and has maintained them through regular meetings regarding key topics with cooperating agencies throughout the NEPA process.

The BLM and Western invited interested federal, state, and county governments to participate as cooperating agencies for the preparation of the TWE Project EIS. To date, 51 agencies have accepted the

invitation. The coordination and consultation must occur in a timely manner and are required before any final decisions are made. Issues related to agency consultation include biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, and land and water management.

6.2.1 Federal and State Agencies

6.2.1.1 Federal Agencies

The BLM and Western are in contact with the following federal agencies:

- Bureau of Indian Affairs Western Region, representing:
  - Rocky Mountain Region, Billings, MT
  - Southwest Region, Albuquerque, NM
- Bureau of Reclamation, Lower Colorado Region
- National Park Service,
  - Intermountain Region, Lakewood, Colorado
  - Pacific West Region, San Francisco, California
- Navy Region Southwest, San Diego, California
- Nevada Army National Guard
- U.S. Army, Region 8
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
  - South Pacific Division
  - Northwestern Division
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representing:
  - Mountain Prairie Region, Lakewood, Colorado
  - Pacific Southwest Region, Sacramento, California
- U.S. Forest Service, Intermountain Region, Ogden, Utah
  - Utah Reclamation Mitigation Conservation Commission

6.2.1.2 State Agencies

The BLM and Western are also coordinating with the following state agencies:

- State of Colorado
  - Colorado Department of Agriculture
  - Colorado Parks and Wildlife
  - Colorado State Land Board
- State of Nevada
  - Nevada Department of Agriculture
  - Nevada Department of Wildlife
  - Nevada Division of State Lands

- State of Utah
  - Utah Department of Agriculture
  - Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
- State of Wyoming
  - Wyoming County Commissioners Association
  - Wyoming Department of Agriculture
  - Wyoming Game and Fish Department

6.2.2 Local Agencies

The BLM and Western are in contact with the following counties:

- Wyoming: Carbon, Sweetwater
- Colorado: Garfield, Mesa, Moffat, Rio Blanco
- Utah: Beaver, Carbon, Dagget, Duchesne, Emery, Grand, Iron, Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, Uintah, Utah, Wasatch, Washington
- Nevada: Clark, Lincoln

The BLM and Western are also coordinating with Little Snake River Conservation District, Medicine Bow Conservation District, Douglas Creek Conservation District, Saratoga-Encampment-Rawlins Conservation District, Sweetwater County Conservation District, White River Conservation District, and N-4 State Grazing Board.

6.2.3 Tribal Government-to-Government Consultation

It is the responsibility of all federal agencies to comply with the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA and the ACHP's regulations when planning and carrying out their undertakings. In doing so, they are required to consult with Native American Tribes, SHPOs, local government entities, and other interested parties, depending on the specifics of the undertaking. Such consultation with Native American Tribes is central to the Section 106 process.

Tribal consultation for the Project began when a certified letter was mailed on July 20, 2010, to all federally recognized Native American Tribes either residing in or with cultural ties to the analysis area. The letter initiated formal government-to-government consultation and informed the Tribes of the proposed undertaking and solicited their concern/comments regarding possible historical and/or traditional ties to the area or the presence of properties of traditional religious and cultural importance. Included in the letters were a Project map, response form, and return address stamped envelope. The response form and return address envelope were enclosed with the letters as a means to inform the BLM and Western if any of the Tribes wish to participate in the consultation efforts or had any concerns associated with the Project.

Seven of the Native American Tribes responded to the initial consultation letter dated July 20, 2010 (Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation, Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada, Las Vegas Paiute Tribe, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, Pueblo of Laguna, and Pueblo of Santo Domingo). A tribal member of the Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada requested copies of the Project maps, which were provided via email. The Las Vegas Paiute Tribe and Pueblo of Santo Domingo indicated on the response form that they do not require consultation at this time; however, they may request other opportunities to consult with the BLM and Western in the future. In their response, the Pueblo of Laguna indicated that the Project will not have a significant impact, but requested an opportunity to review any newly discovered archaeological sites and that photographs be taken of the sites.

Face-to-face meetings with the BLM and Western were requested by the remaining three Tribes (Goshute, Duckwater Shoshone, and Paiute Tribe of Utah).

BLM and Western met with the Paiute Tribe of Utah on December 1, 2010, and the Duckwater Shoshone as well as the Ely Shoshone on January 12, 2011. In January of 2011, the Utah BLM contacted the Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation in response to their request for a meeting. During their discussion, the Goshute tribe determined that the Project was "not very close to their tribe," and therefore, no meeting would be necessary. The Pueblo of Laguna, Pueblo of Santo Domingo, and Las Vegas Paiute returned a response indicating that the information provided in the letter notification was sufficient and no further consultation was necessary. The Ely Shoshone sent a response requesting more information about the Project; the BLM contacted the tribe in August 2010 to discuss the Project. Representatives from the Ely Shoshone attended the meeting on January 12, 2011, with BLM and Western. At this meeting, the Duckwater Shoshone requested large Project maps of the areas where the Project could affect tribal lands. These maps were provided to the Duckwater Shoshone through the Ely, Nevada BLM FO.

In early 2011, follow-up phone calls were made to all the tribes to update tribal contact information. New information was update to the Project's tribal contact list in preparation for a second letter to be mailed in the fall of 2011. The second letter will request more focused information regarding tribal concerns and sites, provide additional information about the consultation process, development of the PA, and findings from the file search conducted in the winter of 2010/2011.

In late September 2011, a second set of letters was sent to the Native American Tribes listed on **Table 3.11-1** inviting them to participate in development of the draft PA. The letters included details of the Project, a description of historic properties identified through the files search, and information on a subsequent upcoming meeting on October 18, 2011, in Salt Lake City, Utah, to discuss the PA process. Only the Hopi Tribe responded to the second letter. The Hopi are interested in ongoing consultation on the Project, and requested copies of the cultural resources inventory report and any proposed treatment plans for review and comment. In addition, the Hopi requested an ethnographic overview of the Project area.

On April 19, 2012, the BLM and Western held an online conference call to discuss the status of the draft PA. The consulting parties listed in Section 3.11.1.1 and the Native American Tribes listed in **Table 3.11-1** were invited to participate on the conference call. None of the invited Native American Tribes participated on the call.

At the request of the Ute Tribal Council, the BLM and Western attended a Ute Tribal Council Meeting on May 31, 2012, and met with the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Southern Ute Tribe, and Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation to discuss the Project. The BLM and Western gave a presentation of the Project, and answered questions from the Tribes. In general, the questions focused on Project components, tribal consultation, BIA responsibilities, and ROWs on tribal lands. The Ute Mountain Ute are concerned about Project impacts to human remains, cultural landscapes, TCPs, and sacred sites.

Western and the BLM attended another Ute Tribal Council meeting on August 28, 2012. During the meeting, detailed Project maps of the 2-mile-wide transmission line corridors, a Project description, and schedule for completion of the draft EIS were presented to the Council members. As requested by the Council, Western and the BLM also met with the Ute Tribe's Energy and Minerals Department. Project information, a Project map, and contact information were left with the Council members and the Energy and Minerals Department. At this time, no other meetings have been held with the Ute Tribal Council.

On November 8, 2012, the BLM and Western held an online conference call to discuss the status of the draft PA. The consulting parties listed in Section 3.11.1.1 and the Native American Tribes listed in **Table 3.11-1** and Section 6.3.3 were invited to participate on the conference call. None of the invited Native American Tribes participated on the call.

On November 26, 2012, the BLM and Western sent letters to five additional pueblos as part of the consultation process. The five pueblos included the Pueblo of San Ildefonso, Pueblo of Santa Clara, Pueblo of Sandia, Pueblo of Taos, and Pueblo of Zia. Included in the letters were a Project map, response form, and return address stamped envelope. The letters included information on the Project, APE, PA process, and historic properties identified as a result of the files search. None of the contacted pueblos responded to the letters.

As of this date, no places of traditional religious and cultural importance to the contacted Native American Tribes have been identified in or near the analysis area through the government-to-government consultation efforts. Concerns expressed by the Tribes have been with human remains, TCPs, cultural landscapes, and sacred sites. Opportunities for the identification of locations of possible traditional religious and cultural importance that may be affected by the Project, as well as opportunities for the Tribes to express their concerns would remain open throughout the consultation process, which currently is ongoing and would continue through Project construction.

Consultation with the tribes and pueblos will continue throughout the Project as stipulated under EO 13175, November 6, 2000.

6.3 EIS Distribution List

In an effort to reduce printing costs, individuals on the mailing list receive postcard notifications directing them to download the EIS from the Project website at http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/hdd/transwest.html. In addition, the document is available on CD and as a limited number of hardcopy versions available at the locations listed below.

- BLM Wyoming State Office, Cheyenne, Wyoming
- BLM Rawlins FO, Rawlins, Wyoming
- BLM Rock Springs FO, Rock Springs, Wyoming
- BLM Little Snake FO, Craig, Colorado
- BLM White River FO, Meeker, Colorado
- BLM Grand Junction FO, Grand Junction, Colorado
- BLM Cedar City FO, Cedar City, Utah
- BLM Fillmore FO, Fillmore, Utah
- BLM Moab FO, Moab, Utah
- BLM Price FO, Price, Utah
- BLM Richfield FO, Richfield, Utah
- BLM St. George FO, St. George, Utah
- BLM Vernal FO, Vernal, Utah
- BLM Egan FO, Egan, Nevada
- BLM Caliente FO, Caliente, Nevada
- BLM Las Vegas FO, Las Vegas, Nevada
- USFS Dixie National Forest

A list of federal, state, and local agencies and representatives, Indian tribes, organizations, media, libraries, and individuals is being maintained throughout the NEPA process. The initial Project mailing list was developed by the BLM Wyoming State Office and has been supplemented as individuals express interest in

the Project. Individuals are provided with the opportunity to be added to the mailing list either through the Project website, registration at public meetings, or by contacting the BLM Wyoming State Office. A complete distribution list is available in the administrative record.

6.3.1 Federal Agencies and Representatives

6.3.1.1 Department of Interior Agencies

- Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Bureau of Reclamation
- Fish & Wildlife Service
- Geological Survey (USGS)
- Mineral Management Service
- National Interagency Fire Center
- National Park Service

6.3.1.2 Department of Energy Agencies

- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- Western Area Power Administration

6.3.1.3 Other Federal Agencies

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Army Corp of Engineers
- Department of Agriculture (USDA)
- Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
- Farm Service Agency
- Forest Service
- Natural Resources Conservation Service
- Department of Defense (DOD)
- Army
- Navy
- Air Force
- Department of Energy (DOE)
- Department of Transportation (DOT)
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
- Federal Highway Administration
- Environmental Protection Agency

6.3.1.4 Congressional Delegations

There are 21 federal legislators (US Senate and House of Representatives) on the Project mailing list.

6.3.2 State and Local Agencies and Representatives

- 25 Colorado state divisions and departments.
- 37 Utah state divisions and departments.
- 12 Nevada state divisions and departments.
- 20 Wyoming state divisions and departments.
- 35 conservation districts and regional water districts.
- 77 state legislators (Senators and Congressmen, Governors and Lieutenant Governors)
- 41 counties.
- 111 cities and municipalities.

6.3.3 Indian Tribes

- Eastern Shoshone of the Wind River Reservation
- Winnemucca Indian Colony of Nevada
- Northern Arapaho Tribe of the Wind River Reservation
- Yerington Paiute Tribe of the Yerington Colony & Campbell Ranch
- Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation
- Yomba-Shoshone Tribe of the Yomba Reservation
- Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation
- Fort Mojave Indian Tribe
- Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation
- Hopi Tribe of Arizona
- Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation
- Kaibab Paiute Tribe
- Paiute Tribe of Utah
- Navajo Nation
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians of Utah
- San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
- Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation
- Jicarilla Apache Tribe
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation of Idaho
- Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation
- Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada
- Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation
- Las Vegas Tribe of Paiute Indians of the Las Vegas Indian Colony
- Lovelock Paiute Tribe of the Lovelock Indian Colony
- Moapa Band of Paiute Indians of the Moapa River Indian Reservation

- Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fallon Reservation and Colony
- Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation
- Reno-Sparks Indian Colony
- Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation
- Summit Lake Paiute Tribe of Nevada
- Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada
- Walker River Paiute Tribe of the Walker River Reservation
- Washoe Tribe of Nevada & California
- Pueblo of Acoma
- Pueblo of Cochiti
- Pueblo of Isleta
- Pueblo of Jemez
- Pueblo of Laguna
- Pueblo of Nambe
- Pueblo of Picuris
- Pueblo of Pojoaque
- Pueblo of San Felipe
- Pueblo of San Ildefonso
- Pueblo of San Juan
- Pueblo of Sandia
- Pueblo of Santa Ana
- Pueblo of Santa Clara
- Pueblo of Santo Domingo
- Pueblo of Taos
- Pueblo of Tesuque
- Pueblo of Zia
- Pueblo of Zuni
- Chemehuevi Indian Tribe

6.3.4 Organizations and Individuals

There are over 325 special interest groups and organizations on the Project mailing list. Organizations, individuals, and companies that have added their names to the mailing list during the Project receive notifications and other relevant Project mailings.

6.4 Preparers and Reviewers

As required by NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1502.17), **Tables 6-2** and **6-3** list the people responsible for disseminating and preparing this Draft EIS. The BLM and Western have retained AECOM as a third-party consultant to assist with the preparation of this EIS (**Table 6-4**). AECOM was selected by the lead agencies

to avoid any conflict of interest. AECOM has certified that it does not have any financial or other interest in the decisions to be made pursuant to this EIS.

6.4.1 Bureau of Land Management

Table 6-2 Bureau of Land Management EIS Team

Team Member	Responsibility/Resource
BLM Wyoming State Office	
Sharon Knowlton	Project Manager
Dennis Saville	Wildlife Program Lead
Ranel Capron	Archaeology Lead
Sherry Lahti-Roche	Visuals Lead
Brent Breithaupt	Paleontology
Ken Peacock	NEPA
Bob Means	Forestry
Beverly Gorny	External Affairs Lead
BLM Rawlins FO	
Heather Schultz	POC-RECO Project Manager
BLM Rock Springs FO	
Carol Montgomery	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Colorado State Office	
Maryanne Kurtinaitis	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Grand Junction FO	
Bridget Clayton	POC-Asst. Field Mgr
BLM Little Snake FO	
Louise McMinn	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM White River FO	
Janet Doll	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Colorado River Valley FO	
Monte Senor	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Utah State Office	
Shauna Derbyshire	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Cedar City FO	
Brandon Johnson	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Fillmore FO	
Clara Stevens	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Moab FO	
Jan Denney	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Price FO	
Connie Leschin	POC-Realty Specialist

Table 6-2 Bureau of Land Management EIS Team

Team Member	Responsibility/Resource
BLM Richfield FO	
Michael Utley	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Salt Lake FO	
Dave Watson	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM St. George FO	
Shered Mullins	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Vernal FO	
Cindy McKee	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Nevada State Office	
Fredrick Marcell	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Ely District	
Dan Netcher	POC-Realty Specialist
BLM Southern Nevada District Office	
Philip Rhinehart	POC-Realty Specialist

6.4.2 Western Area Power Administration

Table 6-3 Western Area Power Administration EIS Team

Team Member	Responsibility/Resources
Steve Blazek	Project Manager
Matt Blevins	Environmental Team Lead
Claire Douthit	NEPA Attorney
John Bremer	Lead Attorney
Ree Rodgers	Archaeology
Stephen Tromly	Archaeology
Misty Kae Sporer	Biology
Carey Ashton	Realty
Jay Braileigh	Biology
Steve Webber	Realty

6.4.3 AECOM

Table 6-4 AECOM EIS Team (Third-Party Consultant) List

AECOM Team Member	Responsibility/Resource	Degree/Certification	Experience (years)
Mark Raming	Project Director	B.A. Zoology and Ecology M.L.A. Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning	37
Matt Petersen	Project Manager, Cumulative Impact Analysis	B.S. Fisheries M.S. Aquatic Ecology	18
Melanie Martin	Assistant Project Manager, Land Use Plan Amendments Lead, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	M.S. Environmental Policy and Natural Resource Management Certificate, Advanced Study in Natural Resource Management B.S. Agriculture	15
David Fetter	Project Coordinator, Water Resources	B.S. Watershed Science	10
Julie Barraza	Wildlife Biology	B.S. Wildlife Biology	5
Bill Berg	Geology, Paleontology, Minerals	M.S. Geology B.S. Geology	24
Erin Bergquist	Vegetation, Special Status Plants	M.S. Ecology B.S. Rangeland Ecosystem Science B.S. Soil and Crop Science B.S. Environmental Studies and Economics	9
Rollin Daggett	Aquatic Species, Special Status Aquatic Species	M.S. Freshwater and Marine Biology B.S. Zoology	36
Chris Dunne	Resource Specialist, Land Use	B.S. Natural Resources Management	15
Ron Dutton Sammons & Dutton, LLC	Socioeconomics	M.S. Economics with specializations in Regional Economics and Public Utility Economics B.S. Economics	25
Scott Ellis	Senior Technical Advisor	B.A. Biology B.A. English	36
Anne Ferguson	Recreation	B.S. Natural Resource Recreation M.S. Environmental Sustainability LEED Accredited Professional	10
Steve Graber	Public Health and Safety	B.S. Natural Resources Management B.A. Economics	8
Allie Grow	Vegetation, Special Status Plants	B.S. Rangeland Ecosystem Science B.S. Soil and Crop Science	12
Janet Guinn	Public Involvement, Consultation and Coordination, Land Use, Special Designations, Recreation, Wild Horses	B.S. Magna Cum Laude, Psychology/ Anthropology	10

Table 6-4 AECOM EIS Team (Third-Party Consultant) List

AECOM Team Member	Responsibility/Resource	Degree/Certification	Experience (years)
Michael Heugh	Transportation	M.E. Transportation Engineering B.S. Mathematical Sciences	6
Brian Kennedy	Transportation	B.A. Special Major, Environmental Planning and Design	29
Spencer Martin	Biological Task Lead	M.E.M. Resource Ecology/Conservation Biology B.A. Biology	24
Terra Mascarenas	Soils	B.S. Soil and Crop Science, Concentration in Environmental Science Certificate of Technology	15
Kim Munson	Cultural Resources	M.A. Anthropology B.A. Anthropology	16
Andrew Newman	Wildlife Biology Lead	M.S. Natural Resource Management B.S. Conservation Biology	10
Merlyn Paulson	Visual Resources	M.L.A. Landscape Architecture B.L.A. Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning	36
Nicole Peters	Resource Specialist	B.S. Natural Resources Management Minor in Business Administration	2
Brent Read	GIS	M.S. Watershed Science B.S. Forestry, Concentration in Forest Fire Science Minor in Spatial Information Management Systems	11
Vince Scheetz	Air Quality	M.S. Systems Management B.S. Mathematics B.S. Atmospheric Science	44
Jamie Schlangen	Wildlife Biology	M.S. Applied Ecology M.P.A. Natural Resource Management and Environmental Policy B.S. Wildlife Ecology	19
Brian Taylor	GIS	B.A. Geography, Emphasis in GIS Minor, Earth Sciences	5
Jason Thoene	GIS Lead	M.S. Geographic Information Systems B.A. Geology	12
Debbie Thompson	Document Production	A.A.S. Business Secretary	28
Ruth Idler	Document Production-Appendix I	General Business Education	25