

Chapter 4

Consultation and Coordination

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In addition to the planning, analysis, and review activities of the EIS preparation, the BLM is conducting consultation, coordination, and public participation. This started with public scoping and will continue throughout the EIS process. The purpose of the consultation and coordination program is to encourage interaction between the BLM and other federal, state, and local agencies; Native American tribes; and the public. BLM's initiative is to inform the public about the project and solicit input to assist in analysis and decision making.

The BLM has made formal and informal efforts to involve, consult, and coordinate with other agencies, tribes, and the public. These efforts ensure that the most appropriate data have been gathered and analyzed and that agency policy and public sentiment and values are considered and incorporated.

4.2 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Agencies and organizations having jurisdiction and/or specific interest in the project were contacted at the beginning of scoping, during resource inventory, and before the publication of the Draft EIS. This section describes the consultation and coordination activities that occurred throughout the EIS process. These include consultation and coordination with agencies, tribes, and stakeholders; the scoping process; and public review of the Draft EIS.

4.2.1 COOPERATING AGENCIES

The BLM Vale District Office is the lead federal agency responsible for the preparation of the EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The USFS Wallowa-Whitman National Forest is a federal cooperating agency in the development of this EIS and, like the BLM, has decision-making authority to permit construction on affected federal lands. The federal, state, and local cooperating agencies are identified in Chapter 1.

4.2.2 FORMAL CONSULTATION

The BLM is required to prepare the EIS in coordination with studies or analyses required by the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.); the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

4.2.2.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES

In accordance with Section 106 (16 U.S.C. 470f) of the NHPA, the federal lead agency and cooperating federal agencies are required to consider the effects of the agencies' undertakings on historic properties listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places. Historic properties can include a broad range of archaeological and historical cultural resources classified as buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts (a "district" is a concentration or linkage of the four other property

1 types). Title 36 CFR Part 800, Protection of Historic Properties, provides implementing regulations for
2 compliance with Section 106 and defines a process for federal agencies to follow to identify and
3 evaluate the eligibility of historic properties and to determine effects of their undertakings on these
4 properties. The regulations also specify the need for meaningful consultation with State Historic
5 Preservation Offices, Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, Native American tribes, and other interested
6 parties during all phases of Section 106 compliance.

7 Pursuant to Title 36 CFR Part 800, and as lead federal agency for the undertaking, the BLM has
8 initiated Section 106 consultation with the following agencies, organizations, and Native American
9 tribes:

- 10 • Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- 11 • Baker City
- 12 • Baker County
- 13 • Bonneville Power Administration
- 14 • Burns-Paiute Tribe
- 15 • Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
- 16 • Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation Tribal Historic Preservation Office
- 17 • Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation
- 18 • Department of the Navy, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Naval Facilities
19 Engineering Command
- 20 • Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe
- 21 • Halt Idaho Power
- 22 • Ice Age Floods Institute
- 23 • Ice Age Floods Institute, Columbia Gorge Chapter
- 24 • Ice Age Floods Institute, Lake Lewis Chapter
- 25 • Idaho State Historic Preservation Office
- 26 • Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, Headquarters and Washington and Oregon
27 Chapters
- 28 • Lewis and Clark Trust
- 29 • Malheur County Historical Society
- 30 • Morrow County
- 31 • National Park Service Ice Age Floods National Geologic Trail at Lake Roosevelt National
32 Recreation Area
- 33 • National Park Service, Lewis and Clark Trail Offices
- 34 • National Park Service, National Historic Trails System Office
- 35 • National Trust for Historic Preservation
- 36 • Nez Perce Tribe

- 1 • Oregon Department of Energy
- 2 • Oregon Historic Trails Advisory Council
- 3 • Oregon State Historic Preservation Office
- 4 • Oregon-California Trail Association, Oregon and Idaho Chapters
- 5 • Poison Creek Neighborhood Group
- 6 • Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation
- 7 • Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation
- 8 • Union County
- 9 • U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District
- 10 • U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- 11 • U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Umatilla National Wildlife Refuge
- 12 • U.S. Forest Service
- 13 • Washington State Historic Preservation Office
- 14 • Yakama Nation

15 Parties to Section 106 consultation also include several members of the public who possess a
16 demonstrable interest in historic properties located within the project area and have petitioned the BLM
17 in writing to participate in consultation.

18 After initiating Section 106 consultation, the BLM invited all consulting parties to attend a one-day
19 meeting in La Grande, Oregon, to review the scope and status of the undertaking, and apprise parties
20 of the agency's ongoing efforts to identify historic properties that may be affected by the B2H Project.
21 The meeting—held on August 16, 2011, at Eastern Oregon University—involved representatives from
22 agencies, contractors, and consulting parties and resulted in the formation of a consulting party
23 workgroup to collaborate on development of a programmatic agreement (PA) to provide for the phased
24 identification, evaluation, and effects assessment for historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR
25 800.15(b).

26 A PA is a legally binding document that identifies the terms and conditions agreed upon to fulfill the
27 lead federal agency's compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)
28 and 36 CFR 800.16(t). PAs document an alternative process to the procedures set forth in the
29 regulations, and they are employed when effects on historic properties are similar and repetitive or are
30 multistate or regional in scope or when effects cannot be fully determined before approval of an
31 undertaking.

32 Between September 17, 2011, and September 10, 2014, the consulting party workgroup met via
33 webinar and teleconference on 34 occasions to develop sections of the project PA. BLM continues to
34 receive comments on the draft project PA from consulting parties. The project PA must be executed
35 before issuance of the Record of Decision.

1 The project PA specifies three groups of consulting parties to the Section 106 process: (1) signatories,
2 (2) invited signatories, and (3) consulting parties. *Signatories* have formal responsibilities for execution
3 of one or more elements of the regulations under 36 CFR Part 800. *Invited signatories* participate in the
4 execution of the terms of the project PA but do not possess regulatory responsibilities. *Concurring*
5 *parties* are individuals, organizations, agencies, or tribal governments that have participated in
6 consultation and maintain an active interest in the project. Concurrence is sought to indicate general
7 agreement with the terms of the project PA; however, a concurring party's signature on the project PA
8 is not equivalent with endorsement of the project.

9 **4.2.2.2 GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT AND SECTION 106** 10 **TRIBAL CONSULTATION**

11 The United States has a unique legal relationship with Native American tribes, as established by the
12 U.S. Constitution, treaties, executive orders, federal statutes, and federal and tribal policies.

13 As sovereign nations, Native American tribes are conferred with legal rights and benefits with respect to
14 their relationship with the U.S. government. This relationship is founded on the U.S. government's trust
15 responsibilities to safeguard tribal sovereignty and self-determination, as well as tribal lands, assets,
16 and resources reserved by treaty and other federally recognized rights. Federal agencies are required
17 by both statute and regulation to consult with Native American tribes on a government-to-government
18 basis on federal actions or undertakings that may affect "trust assets," including cultural and natural
19 resources, of concern to tribes. These statutes include the American Indian Religious Freedom Act,
20 NHPA, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the Religious Freedom
21 Restoration Act, and NEPA.

22 Executive and secretarial orders further establish the relationships between federal agencies and tribal
23 governments. These include Executive Orders 13007 (Indian Sacred Sites), 13084 (Consultation and
24 Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments), and 13175 (Consultation with Indian Tribal
25 Governments); Secretarial Orders 3175 (Departmental Responsibilities for Indian Trust Resources) and
26 3206 (American Indian Tribal Rights and the Endangered Species Act); and executive memoranda
27 issued in September 2004 (Government-to-Government Relationship with Tribal Governments) and
28 October 2009 (Tribal Consultation). Government-to-government consultation involves the process of
29 seeking, discussing, and considering tribes' views on policies, undertakings, and decisions such as
30 environmental review of the proposed B2H Project.

31 In August 2008, the BLM formally initiated consultation with nine Native American tribes that have
32 previously expressed claims to cultural affiliation with the project area to inform them of the project and
33 to inquire about their interest in continuing government-to-government consultation. The contacted
34 tribes are as follows:

- 35 • Burns-Paiute Tribe
- 36 • Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
- 37 • Joseph Band of the Nez Perce

- 1 • Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- 2 • Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation
- 3 • Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe
- 4 • Nez Perce Tribe
- 5 • Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation
- 6 • Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation

7 Appendix A provides a record of government-to-government consultation activities for the proposed
8 B2H Project.

9 Government-to-government consultation is guided by BLM Manual Handbook H-8120-1, *Guidelines for*
10 *Conducting Tribal Consultation* (BLM 2004); by the provisions of Secretarial Order 3317 (Department of
11 the Interior Policy on Consultation with Indian Tribes); and corresponding BLM Instruction
12 Memorandum No. 2012-061 (BLM 2012), which specifies meaningful direct involvement of the agency
13 official with delegated authority for actions and conduct of consultation within the context of ongoing
14 relationships involving regularly recurring meetings where appropriate. The venue for government-to-
15 government consultation for the B2H Project has followed the established form of contact preferred by
16 each tribe. Consultation has generally involved formal letters and submission of material via U.S. Postal
17 Service Certified Mail, with follow-up telephone contact. Two tribes, the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the
18 Duck Valley Indian Reservation and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, have
19 indicated regular meetings as their preferred form of consultation on the B2H Project.

20 Government-to-government consultation has occurred between the BLM and the Shoshone-Paiute
21 Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation through third-party-facilitated ad hoc Wings and Roots
22 meetings, held at the BLM Boise District Office or BLM Idaho State Office. The Shoshone-Paiute Tribes
23 provide their concerns about the project and comments on work products directly to the BLM at these
24 meetings. Although the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes have participated in consultation on the development
25 of the project PA, they have indicated that their project concerns are much broader than the topics
26 under the purview of NHPA consultation. They have expressed concern about the limited definition of
27 “historic properties” under Section 106 and are pursuing development of a separate agreement
28 document with the BLM to address their concerns about project effects on cultural resources
29 considered important to the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes.

30 The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation have provided comments both through the
31 scoping process and through formal government-to-government consultation under Section 106 of the
32 NHPA. Consultation with the Confederated Tribes has occurred through face-to-face and conference-
33 call meetings. Through consultation, the Confederated Tribes have expressed concerns regarding the
34 level of effort (pedestrian inventory of 15 percent random sample of lands within the area of potential
35 effects) employed to identify historic properties, as well as the general time frame for responding to
36 their concerns about project communications and the timeliness of response to their comments on
37 documents.

1 **4.2.2.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

2 Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, calls for interagency cooperation to
3 conserve federally listed species and designated critical habitats. Pursuant to Section 7, federal
4 agencies are required to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the National Oceanic
5 and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries (formerly, the National Marine Fisheries Service) or
6 both on all projects that may affect federally listed threatened, endangered, and candidate species
7 (including plants, fish, and wildlife). In accordance with these regulations, the USFWS has participated
8 in project-related discussions and meetings even before the initiation of preparation of the EIS. NOAA
9 Fisheries was invited to project meetings beginning in July 2012 when it became clear that the
10 proposed B2H Project may impact species under its jurisdiction.

11 The USFWS lists of endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species and designated critical
12 habitats in Oregon and Idaho counties where project activities may occur were periodically reviewed.
13 The most recent review of these county lists was completed in June 2013. Two biological assessments
14 will be prepared to evaluate the effects of the selected project routing on species listed under the
15 Endangered Species Act—one evaluating the effects on terrestrial and inland aquatic species will be
16 submitted to the USFWS, and one evaluating the effects on anadromous fish species (those species
17 that migrate inland from the ocean to spawn) will be submitted to NOAA Fisheries. Submittal of the
18 biological assessments for species with a “may adversely affect” determination will initiate the formal
19 Section 7 consultation process.

20 **4.3 SCOPING PROCESS**

21 The scoping process is purposefully conducted early in the EIS process and open to all interested
22 agencies and the public. The intent is to solicit comments and identify issues that help direct the
23 approach and depth of the environmental studies and analysis needed to prepare the EIS.

24 **4.3.1 2008 SCOPING**

25 IPC submitted its initial right-of-way applications to the BLM on December 19, 2007, and to the USFS
26 on March 25, 2008. On September 12, 2008, the BLM and USFS published a Notice of Intent to
27 prepare the B2H EIS (BLM and USFS 2008). Public scoping meetings occurred in October 2008. This
28 initial scoping comment period was from September 12 through November 14, 2008. The BLM, USFS,
29 and the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) hosted six public meetings in October 2008. The
30 meetings were held in Marsing, Idaho; Ontario, Oregon; Baker City, Oregon; Island City, Oregon;
31 Pendleton, Oregon; and Boardman, Oregon. A total of 306 people attended the 2008 scoping meetings.
32 The 2008 scoping report was published on April 10, 2009 (BLM 2009) and is available on the B2H
33 Project website: <http://www.boardmantohemingway.com/documents.aspx>.

34 **4.3.2 COMMUNITY ADVISORY PROCESS**

35 Based on feedback from the public and local, state, and federal agencies during the 2008 scoping
36 period, IPC requested the BLM to suspend processing the right-of-way application so that IPC could
37 conduct additional siting studies for the proposed transmission line project. IPC initiated a Community

1 Advisory Process (CAP) in March 2009. Through the CAP, IPC engaged communities in the project
2 area to help site the proposed B2H Project. IPC launched the CAP by inviting private landowners, local
3 officials, business leaders, and other stakeholders to participate on Project Advisory Teams (PATs).
4 Federal agency representatives did not participate directly in the CAP or the PATs, because the CAP
5 was outside the NEPA scoping process, but they did participate in an information meeting to share
6 information about federal agency roles and responsibilities. The Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck
7 Valley Indian Reservation likewise did not participate in the CAP. The PATs met from May 2009
8 through May 2010 to identify community issues and concerns, to evaluate a range of possible routes,
9 and to recommend proposed and alternative routes. In addition to hosting approximately 30 PAT
10 meetings, IPC hosted 2 rounds of open houses for the public to provide feedback and
11 recommendations on the process.

12 PAT members initially proposed 49 different route segments, which were evaluated by IPC and its
13 consultants based on permitting difficulty, constructability, and mitigation costs. As a result of the
14 routing analysis, IPC identified three potential route alternatives that met its permitting, construction,
15 and mitigation requirements.

16 Based on feedback and recommendations from the PATs, IPC revised the location of its proposed
17 route and, in June 2010, submitted a revised right-of-way application to the BLM. The most significant
18 changes proposed in the revised application include the following:

- 19 • Avoidance of lands designated as exclusive farm use in southeastern Oregon, where possible
- 20 • An increase in the percentage of the route located on public lands

21 A more detailed explanation of the changes is available on the project website:

22 http://www.boardmantohemingway.com/faq_routing.aspx.

23 **4.3.3 2010 SCOPING**

24 In response to the revised right-of-way applications (IPC 2010), the BLM and USFS initiated additional
25 scoping pursuant to NEPA. The BLM published a revised Notice of Intent on July 27, 2010, which
26 reinitiated scoping for the B2H Project under a new scoping comment period of July 27 through
27 September 27, 2010 (BLM USFS 2010). The BLM, USFS, and ODOE hosted eight scoping meetings in
28 August 2010. The meetings were held in Marsing, Idaho; Ontario, Oregon; Baker City, Oregon;
29 Pendleton, Oregon; Boardman, Oregon; La Grande, Oregon; Mount Vernon, Oregon; and Burns,
30 Oregon. A total of 241 people attended the 2010 meetings. At the request of the public, BLM agreed to
31 include comments generated during the CAP as scoping comments for the NEPA process. A Revised
32 Scoping Report was published in April 2011 (BLM 2011) and is available on the B2H Project website:

33 <http://www.boardmantohemingway.com/documents.aspx>.

1 **4.4 INFORMATION DISSEMINATION**

2 Initiation of the EIS process and the public scoping meetings were announced through the *Federal*
3 *Register*, notification letters, media announcements, community calendar notifications, and the project
4 website.

5 **4.4.1 FEDERAL REGISTER**

6 The 2008 public scoping process began with the publication of a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register*
7 on September 12, 2008. Given substantial changes to the proposed route resulting from IPC's CAP
8 process, the BLM published a revised Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* on July 27, 2010, to
9 announce the reinitiation of the NEPA scoping process to solicit public comments.

10 **4.4.2 NOTIFICATION LETTERS TO ORGANIZATIONS AND** 11 **INDIVIDUALS**

12 In 2008, scoping notifications were sent to 2,954 individuals and organizations. The mailing list for the
13 notice was developed by merging contacts maintained by the BLM, USFS, ODOE, and IPC.

14 In 2010, the scoping notification was sent to 6,889 people. The number of individuals receiving
15 notifications increased substantially between 2008 and 2010 through the addition of new landowners,
16 public meeting and comment period participants, and other interested parties.

17 **4.4.3 MEDIA ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNITY-CALENDAR** 18 **NOTIFICATIONS**

19 The ODOE, BLM, and USFS prepared news releases for both the 2008 and 2010 scoping efforts to
20 introduce the project, announce the scoping period, and publicize the scoping meetings and their
21 respective locations. The news releases were posted on the BLM Vale District website. Legal notices
22 and display advertisements were published in 11 local newspapers in 2008 and 15 local newspapers in
23 2010.

24 Community calendar notices were also submitted to the same newspapers for the 2008 and 2010
25 scoping periods. A public service announcement for the public scoping meetings and scoping process
26 was issued as a news release on October 22, 2008, to local and regional newspapers, radio stations,
27 and TV stations in Idaho and Oregon.

28 **4.4.4 B2H PROJECT WEBSITE**

29 The project website (<http://www.boardmantohemingway.com>) provides a central location for public
30 information from BLM and other agencies. The project website includes:

- 31 • Project status updates
- 32 • Project schedule
- 33 • Description of the proposed B2H Project
- 34 • Project documents, fact sheets, and maps

- 1 • Public participation opportunities
- 2 • Overview of the NEPA process
- 3 • Overview of the ODOE transmission line siting process
- 4 • Public Newswire, a newsletter providing updates about the project and IPC

5 **4.5 PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIS**

6 This Draft EIS has been distributed for review and comment by agencies, interested organizations, and
7 individuals. During the 90-day comment period, the BLM will hold public open houses to receive
8 comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIS. Comments received from the Draft EIS review and public
9 meetings will be compiled, analyzed, and summarized and will be addressed in the Final EIS. The
10 public release of the Final EIS will be followed by a 30-day public comment period before the BLM may
11 issue the Record of Decision.

12 The Draft EIS was posted to the project website (<http://www.boardmantohemingway.com>), and
13 electronic copies on CD-ROMs were produced for distribution. The Draft EIS has been distributed to
14 agencies required to review the Draft EIS and to other agencies, organizations, and individuals that
15 requested copies.

16 Comments on the Draft EIS may be submitted in writing at the scheduled public open-house meetings
17 or by letter or email as instructed in the Dear Reader letter. Dates and addresses of the public open-
18 house meetings will be announced on the project website at least 15 days before the meetings.

19 **4.6 PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS**

20 The following individuals from the BLM, the USFS, and the third-party contractor team were responsible
21 for preparing the Draft EIS.

1 **4.6.1 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**

Oregon State Office	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Al Doelker, Fisheries Program Leader • Glenn Frederick, Biologist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leslie Frewing, Planner • John Zancanella, Paleontologist (Archaeologist)
Idaho State Office	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruce Bohn, Hydrologist • Tim Carrigan, Wildlife Biologist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natalie Cooper, Realty Specialist • Robin Fehlau, Recreation
Vale District Office	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ralph Falsetto, GIS Specialist • Susan Fritts, Botanist, Threatened and Endangered Plants • June Galloway, Biologist • Donald N. Gonzalez, District Manager • Brent Grasty, Planning and Environmental Coordinator • Scott Lightcap, Fish Biologist • Linus Meyer, Hydrology • Richard Pastor, Hydrology, Fisheries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kari Points, Outdoor Recreation Planner • Diane Pritchard, Archaeologist • Marissa Russell, GIS Specialist • Lynn Silva, Weed Specialist • Renee Straub, Project Manager • Jennifer Theisen, Archaeologist • Brian Watts, Fire Ecologist • Naomi Wilson, Natural Resource Specialist
Burns District Office	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holly Orr, Project Manager (former) 	
Boise District Office	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Fincher, District Manager • John Sullivan, Supervisory Realty Specialist 	
Baker Field Office	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin McConnell, Weed Specialist • Kevin McCoy, Outdoor Recreation Planner and Visual Resources • John Quintela, Fisheries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Rademacher, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist • Melissa Yzquierdo, Wildlife Biologist
Owyhee Field Office	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kelli Barnes, Archaeologist • Elizabeth Corbin, Botanist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ryan Homan, Outdoor Recreation Planner and Visual Resources • Brad Jost, Wildlife Biologist
Washington Office	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tamara Gertsch, National Project Manager • John McCarthy, Landscape Architect 	
National Operations Center	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karla Rogers, Visual Resources 	
National Transmission Support Team	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jenna Gaston, Cultural Resources Specialist • Jason Sutter, Biologist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scott Whitesides, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Utah State Office

1 **4.6.2 U.S. FOREST SERVICE**

Wallowa-Whitman National Forest	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Armon, Engineer • Arlene Blumton, Project Coordinator • Bob Clements, Silviculturist • Sarah Crump, Archaeologist • Dan Ermovick, Recreation Specialist • Susan Geer, Botanist • Erik Harvey, Archeologist • Aric Johnson, Range Conservationist • John Laurence, Forest Supervisor • Maura Laverty, Range • Brad Lovatt, Fish Biologist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donna Mattson, Landscape Architect • Sophia Millar, Environmental Coordinator • Mike Montgomery, Recreation Technician • Tom Montoya, Deputy Forest Supervisor • Kat Naughton, Fuels Specialist • Laura Navarrete, Wildlife Biologist • Dea Nelson, Environmental Coordinator • Mark Penninger, Wildlife Biologist • Josh White, Invasive Species • Gene Yates, Botanist
Regional Energy Team	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kristen Bonanno, Regional Energy Team Coordinator • James Capursco, Fisheries Biologist • Brad Cownover, Landscape Architect • Rochelle Desser, Invasive Species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Hampton, Environmental Coordinator • Elaine Rybak, Wildlife • Jim Sauser, Special Uses • Jeff Walker, Heritage Program

1 **4.6.3 LOGAN SIMPSON DESIGN**

EIS Management, Coordination, and Production	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erik Anderson, Deputy Program Manager Environmental Planner • Jim Carter, Program Manager Environmental Planner • Ambur Mathews, EIS Coordination Environmental Planner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roy Baker, GIS and Map Production GIS Specialist • Kerri Flanagan, Editing and Document Production Technical Editor • Ben Hammer, GIS and Graphics Graphics Specialist
EIS Resource Analyses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Bockey, Visual Resources Visual Resource Specialist • Brett Burgess, Wildlife Wildlife Biologist • Jeremy Call, National Historic Trails Environmental Planner • Jeremy Casteel, Water Resources Permitting Specialist • Erin Davis, Cultural Resources Archaeologist • Alyson Eddie, Fish Wildlife Biologist • Peter Gosling, Wildlife and Fish Wildlife Biologist • Craig Johnson, Visual Resources, National Historic Trails Visual Resource Specialist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kathryn Leonard, Cultural Resources, Tribal Coordination, National Historic Trails Archaeologist • Kay Nicholson, Wildlife and Fish Wildlife Biologist • Greta Rayle, National Historic Trails Archaeologist • Richard Remington, Wildlife, Vegetation, Fish Biologist • Diane Simpson-Colebank, Visual Resources Visual Resource Specialist • Ian Tackett, Wildlife and Fish Wildlife Biologist

2

1 **4.7 DRAFT EIS DISTRIBUTION**

Native American Tribal Governments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation • Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation • Shoshone Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation • Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation • Joseph Band of the Nez Perce • Nez Perce Tribe • Burns-Paiute Tribe • Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation • Yakama Indian Nation
Federal Agencies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory Council on Historic Preservation • Bonneville Power Administration • Bureau of Indian Affairs • Bureau of Land Management (see full list in section below) • Bureau of Reclamation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pacific Northwest Region • Federal Aviation Administration • Federal Depository Library System, Government Printing Office • Federal Energy Regulatory Commission • Federal Highway Administration • National Marine Fisheries Service • National Park Service • U.S. Department of the Air Force • U.S. Department of the Navy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naval Air Station Whidbey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • U.S. Army Corps of Engineers • U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Offices (see full list in section below) • U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service • U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Utilities Service • U.S. Department of Energy • U.S. Department of the Interior • U.S. Environmental Protection Agency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Region 10 • U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office • La Grande Field Office • U.S. Geological Survey • Interagency Rapid Response Team for Transmission
Local Governments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Boardman, Oregon • City of Pilot Rock, Oregon • City of Pendleton, Oregon • City of La Grande, Oregon • City of Baker City, Oregon • City of Ontario, Oregon • City of Vale, Oregon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Melba, Idaho • City of Marsing, Idaho • City of Parma, Idaho
County Governments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morrow County, Oregon • Umatilla County, Oregon • Union County, Oregon • Baker County, Oregon • Malheur County, Oregon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owyhee County, Idaho • Canyon County, Idaho • Payette County, Idaho • Washington County, Idaho

U.S. Congress	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • U.S. House of Representatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon District 2 • Idaho District 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • U.S. Senate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon • Idaho
State of Oregon	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Governor’s Office • Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife • Oregon Department of Energy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern Oregon Office • State Historic Preservation Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House of Representatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District 57 • District 58 • District 60 • Senate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District 29 • District 30
State of Idaho	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idaho Governor’s Office • Idaho Office of Energy Resources • Department of Lands • Department of Fish and Game • State Historic Preservation Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idaho State Senate District 23 • Idaho State Representatives District 23
Bureau of Land Management Offices	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Washington Office • Pacific Northwest Regional Infrastructure Team • Idaho State Office • Boise District Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vale District Office • Prineville District Office • Malheur Field Office • Baker Field Office • Owyhee Field Office
U.S. Forest Service Offices	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wallowa-Whitman National Forest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whitman Ranger District–Baker City • La Grande Ranger District–La Grande • Supervisor’s Office–Baker City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pacific Northwest Region 6 Office

1