

CHAPTER 5—CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

This chapter describes the efforts undertaken by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) throughout the process of developing the Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to ensure the process remained open and inclusive to the extent possible. This chapter also describes efforts to comply with legal requirements to consult and coordinate with various government agencies. These efforts include public scoping; designating cooperating agencies; governmental consultation; and the consistency process with tribal, local, county, and state plans.

BLM land use planning activities are conducted in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requirements, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, and U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) and BLM policies and procedures implementing NEPA. NEPA and the associated laws, regulations, and policies require the BLM to seek public involvement early and throughout the planning process in order to develop a reasonable range of alternatives of proposed actions, and to prepare environmental documents that disclose the potential impacts of proposed actions and alternatives. In addition, Title II, Section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) directs the BLM to coordinate planning efforts with Native American Indian tribes, other federal departments, and agencies of state and local governments as part of its land use planning process. Specifically, FLPMA Section 202(b)(9) directs that BLM “land use plans ... shall be consistent with State and local plans to the maximum extent [those plans are] consistent with federal law and the purposes of this Act.” This chapter documents this consultation and coordination.

5.1 COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT

The DOI is committed to a collaborative approach to public land management. The more that people can be empowered as stewards of the land, the more effective the implementation of the Department’s conservation mission will be. To improve stewardship at all levels of government and “to foster a Nation of citizen stewards,” the Secretary of the Interior has advanced a four C’s philosophy: conservation through communication, consultation, and cooperation (USDOI 2006).

The BLM has sought for public communication by providing information to the public and extending several requests for information throughout the planning process. This has provided a valuable exchange of ideas with interested organizations and publics. The process of this outreach is described below in the public participation section.

Federal regulation directs the BLM to invite eligible federal agencies, state and local governments, and federally recognized Indian tribes to participate as cooperating agencies when developing or revising resource management plans (43 CFR 1610.3-1(b)). These agencies are invited to participate because they have jurisdiction by law or can offer special expertise. Cooperating agency status provides a formal framework for these governmental units to engage in active collaboration with a lead federal agency in the planning process.

Following publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare this Draft EIS, Kanab Field Office representatives met with representatives from Kane and Garfield counties, Utah. As a result of these meetings, the BLM entered into a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with each county, formalizing the counties as cooperating agencies in the RMP revision. In addition, there is a statewide agreement between the BLM and the State of Utah (including departments and divisions, such as the Division of Wildlife Resources and Division of Parks and Recreation) to be included as cooperating agencies in BLM RMP revisions. The BLM also provided opportunities for interested Native American tribes to become

cooperating agencies. Only the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe requested cooperating agency status, and the BLM entered into an MOA formalizing the Tribe's status as a cooperating agency.

As directed by 43 CFR 1610.4, the BLM has collaborated with the cooperating agencies during data inventory and information collection, analysis of the management situation, formulation of alternatives, estimation of effects of alternatives, and selection of the preferred alternative, although the decision to select a preferred alternative remained the exclusive responsibility of the BLM (43 CFR 1610.4-7). Throughout the planning process the BLM invited the cooperating agencies to provide planning information on various planning topics, including geographical information system (GIS) data layers and other county- or state-level information. The BLM invited designated representatives from the cooperating agencies to attend each Interdisciplinary Team (ID Team) meeting. Representatives from the agencies were also invited to several sub-ID Team meetings that specifically addressed resources within the agencies' area of special expertise and/or resources for which they have jurisdiction by law.

The BLM sought further input from all cooperating agencies by affording them the opportunity to review and provide comments on planning documents (i.e., Scoping Report, Socioeconomic Baseline Profile, Analysis of the Management Situation, Alternatives, and Preliminary Draft EIS). Throughout the planning process, the cooperating agencies worked with the BLM and provided verbal and/or written comments that helped to develop this Draft RMP/EIS.

5.2 NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act and several other legal authorities (see BLM Manual 8120) as well as in recognition of the government-to-government relationship between tribes and the Federal Government, the BLM has initiated Native American consultation efforts related to preparation of the Kanab RMP. In December 2004, the BLM provided official notification of the land use plan (LUP) revision to 21 tribes/groups through certified mail with return receipt requested. The BLM mailed notification requests to the following tribes/groups:

- Kaibab-Paiute Tribe
- Cedar Band of Paiutes
- Indian Peak Band of Paiutes
- Kanosh Band of Paiutes
- Koosharem Band of Paiutes
- Shivwits Band of Paiutes
- San Juan Southern Paiute
- Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department
- Navajo Nation—Coppermine Chapter Coordinator
- Navajo Nation—Navajo Mountain Chapter
- Navajo Nation—Cameron Chapter
- Navajo Nation—Kaibeto Chapter
- Navajo Nation—Tuba City Chapter Coordinator
- Navajo Nation—Bodaway/Gap Chapter
- Navajo Nation—Olijato Chapter
- Navajo Nation—Coalmine Canyon Chapter Coordinator
- Navajo Nation—Lechee Chapter
- Hopi Tribe
- Hopi Tribe—Hopi Cultural Preservation Office
- Ute Cultural Rights and Preservation
- Pueblo of Zuni

The notification letter invited tribal governments to become involved in the planning processes and outlined potential consultation opportunities throughout the planning process. The letter also requested input on issues and concerns to be considered during the planning process and initiated efforts to identify areas of traditional cultural concern. As of July 2005 the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe has officially responded to initial consultation requests and has signed an MOA formalizing cooperating agency status. The Navajo Tribe did not request cooperating agency status, but requested period updates by remaining on the RMP mailing list and receiving planning bulletins. No other tribes replied to the notification letter.

Copies of the Draft RMP/EIS have been sent to all tribes noted in the above list for review and comment. Consultation will continue throughout the planning process. This portion of Chapter 5 will be updated in the Final EIS to reflect consultation efforts.

In this planning effort the BLM is not acting as the agent of Indian trust assets, and there are no trust assets involved. Although public land resources in the decision area are not Indian trust assets, the BLM must make an affirmative effort to consult with Native American Tribes and must consider their input fairly. However, public land decisions are based on multiple-use principles and a complex framework of legal responsibilities, not on property principles associated with Indian trust assets.

5.3 INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

FLPMA Section 202(b)(9) directs that the BLM shall consider those “State, local, and tribal plans that are [relevant] in the development of land use plans for public lands; assist in resolving, to the extent practical, inconsistencies between federal and non-Federal Government plans, and shall provide for meaningful public involvement of State and local government officials ... in the development of land use decisions for public lands.” The BLM identified the following state and local plans as relevant to this planning process:

- Kane County General Plan, 1998
- Garfield County General Plan, as amended in 1998
- State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, 2003
- Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy, 2005
- Scenic Byway 12 Corridor Management Plan, 2001
- Coral Pink Sand Dunes State Park General Management Plan, 2004.

As noted in Section 5.1, Collaborative Management, Kane and Garfield counties and the State of Utah are cooperating agencies and were provided opportunities to provide input throughout the planning processes. Consistency with agency and local and state government plans was primarily accomplished through frequent communications and cooperative efforts (meetings and communications) between the BLM ID Team and these cooperating agencies. This regular communication has ensured that potentially inconsistent decisions could be identified early and resolved to the extent possible. Appendix J, County General Plan Public Land Decisions Summary, contains decisions from the Garfield and Kane County General Plans that apply to public land management. Combining communication with cooperating agencies, ID Team review of Appendix J, reviews of the plan consistency section in the Analysis of the Management Situation, and review of other statewide plans ensured that the preferred alternative is consistent with state and local plans to the extent possible.

The BLM cultural resource management program operates in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800, which provides specific procedures for consultation between the BLM and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The SHPO has been included as a cooperating agency within the MOA with the State of Utah. The BLM has coordinated with the SHPO during the development of the Draft RMP/EIS,

specifically addressing how cultural resources may be affected. A copy of the Draft RMP/EIS has been sent to the SHPO for review and comment. This portion of Chapter 5 will be updated in the Final EIS to reflect consultation efforts.

During the preparation of the Coal Unsuitability Report, the BLM coordinated with the State of Utah (Governor's Office and the Division of Wildlife Resources) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The BLM held several meetings with the State of Utah and USFWS to coordinate information about species in the Kanab planning area. The BLM and the State of Utah, in coordination with USFWS, jointly identified federal lands with habitat for species of high interest including elk, mule deer, and Greater sage-grouse.

5.4 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

In developing the Draft RMP/EIS, the BLM coordinated with numerous other federal agencies. There are some legal statutes requiring official consultation with some federal agencies. Coordination and consultation (as necessary) efforts are described below.

5.4.1 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Consultation with USFWS is required under Section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 prior to initiation of any project by the BLM that may affect any federally listed or endangered species or its habitat. This RMP revision is considered to be a major project and the Draft EIS defines potential impacts to threatened and endangered species as a result of management actions proposed in the alternatives. USFWS staff participated in interdisciplinary team meetings and was provided drafts of alternative decisions for discussion and input.

The BLM requested a list of federally listed threatened or endangered plant and animal species present in the decision area on December 13, 2004; USFWS responded to this request by providing the list of species to be considered in the planning process on December 15, 2004. Due to the length of the planning process, the BLM requested USFWS to confirm the list of species prior to impact analysis in early April 2006; USFWS responded in mid-April 2006, providing a reference to the USFWS Mountain-Prairie Region website listing of Utah Endangered Species by county. This list was consulted throughout preparation of the Draft EIS and subsequent consultation documents.

During the preparation of the Coal Unsuitability Report, the BLM coordinated with USFWS to evaluate the coal unsuitability criteria defined in 43 CFR 3461.5. The BLM informally consulted with USFWS to identify habitat designated or proposed as critical and determined by both agencies to be of essential value. In addition, the BLM coordinated with USFWS to identify federal lands with high-priority habitats for migratory bird species.

A Draft Biological Assessment that evaluates the impacts of the preferred alternative (proposed action) on federal threatened and endangered species has been submitted to USFWS concurrently with public release of the Draft RMP/EIS. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will include the Final Biological Assessment and resulting USFWS Biological Opinion. Consultation with USFWS will continue throughout the RMP process and implementation of the plan. This portion of Chapter 5 will be updated in the Final EIS to reflect consultation efforts.

5.4.2 National Park Service

Contacts were made early in the planning process with Zion National Park, Bryce Canyon National Park, and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (NRA), the three national park units that share boundaries with the Kanab planning area. BLM representatives met with the National Park Service representatives during scoping and discussed issues of concern. Zion and Bryce Canyon National Parks provided comments during the scoping period, and representatives from the National Park Service attended public scoping meetings. Issues raised by the National Park Service were specifically addressed during alternative development. All three National Park Service units have been provided copies of the Draft RMP/EIS for review and comment.

5.4.3 U.S. Forest Service

The Kanab Field Office shares common boundaries with the Dixie National Forest. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is engaged in revising its LUP at the same time that BLM is revising its plan. As well as sharing boundaries, the two agencies share some common issues. BLM communication with the Dixie National Forest regarding the planning process has been largely informal, addressing those boundary issues that the two agencies share such as Wild and Scenic River suitability. The Dixie National Forest was provided a copy of the Draft RMP/EIS for review and comment.

5.4.4 Environmental Protection Agency

NEPA regulations require that environmental impact statements be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for review and comment (40 CFR 1506.9). The Kanab Draft RMP/EIS has been submitted to the EPA for review as required by CEQ regulations. This portion of Chapter 5 will be updated in the Final EIS to reflect coordination efforts.

5.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation is integral to ensuring that the wide range of planning issues important to public land users are addressed. Public participation in the BLM planning process includes a variety of efforts to identify and address public concerns and needs. Public involvement assists the agencies in the following:

- Broadening the information base for decision-making
- Informing the public about the RMP/EIS and the potential impacts associated with various management decisions
- Ensuring that public needs and viewpoints are understood by the BLM.

5.5.1 Scoping Period

The planning process formally began with the publication of the NOI in the *Federal Register* on April 2, 2004, which announced the BLM's intent to revise its LUPs. The formal public scoping period ended on February 15, 2005. The purpose of scoping, as defined by NEPA, is to determine the scope and significance of issues related to a proposed action such as the development and implementation of a new RMP (40 CFR 1501.7). These issues guide the development of alternatives that will be evaluated in the EIS and will ultimately guide development of the RMP. Scoping also provides the public with an opportunity to learn about the management of public lands and helps the BLM identify the public's concerns regarding resources within the decision area. This section provides a summary of the scoping

process. More information on the scoping process is available in the *Scoping Report for the Kanab RMP and EIS*.

Public scoping meetings provided an opportunity for interested parties to submit scoping comments and to be involved early in the planning process (40 CFR 1501.7). The NOI announced that the BLM would hold “public meetings throughout the region in order to promote public involvement in the process.” These meetings were announced in the local media and through a planning bulletin and a follow-up postcard. Scoping meeting information was available on the active project website (www.kanabmp.com). The news release was also posted on the Utah BLM website. Public scoping meeting announcements were available to the public on the project website as early as November 2004, and press releases on public meetings appeared on January 12, 2005. The BLM also posted fliers throughout the counties in locations of heavy traffic such as post offices, local convenience stores, supermarkets, municipal buildings, local businesses, and local recreation sites. Nearly 170 individuals registered at four scoping meetings (Table 5-1), providing hundreds of comments addressing a wide range of issues. The number of participants in communities closest to the planning area indicates the high level of local interest in the planning and management of the area.

Table 5-1. Meeting Location/Attendance

Meeting Location	Meeting Date	Attendance
Salt Lake City, UT	January 13, 2005	31
Kanab, UT	January 18, 2005	77
Escalante, UT	January 19, 2005	30
Panguitch, UT	January 20, 2005	29
Total		167

In addition to receiving comments from public scoping meetings, the BLM solicited written scoping comments. Written comments were accepted throughout the public scoping period. Comments received shortly after the deadline were accepted to accommodate mail delays. A total of 997 individuals submitted written scoping comments. These comments were accepted via mail, e-mail, video, and the RMP website (Table 5-2).

Table 5-2. Kanab RMP/EIS Written Comments Medium

Method of Submittal	Responses Received
Mail or Delivered in Person	64
E-Mail	904
Oral (Video)	11
Web	18
Total Responses	997

Throughout the scoping period, more than 1,160 individuals provided comments to the BLM (Table 5-2) or attended public scoping meetings (Table 5-1). As the written comments were analyzed, both by computer comparison and by manual review, four general form letters were identified. These letters represent 848 (85 percent) of the 997 total responses. Identical letters were analyzed based on the issues they raised. Letters with additional text were reviewed manually to determine whether the additional text

identified issues that the form portion of the letter had not already raised. It is important to note that such grouping of identical comments does not reduce the importance of the issues raised. NEPA regulations on scoping are clear that the scoping process is not a vote, but an opportunity to “determine the scope and the significant issues to be analyzed in depth in the environmental impact statement” and to “identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review” (40 CFR 1501.7). Therefore, if 800 letters raise the same issue and one letter raises a different issue, both issues must be equally considered in the NEPA document.

Analysis of approximately 600 unique comments resulted in the identification of issues to be addressed during development of the Kanab RMP. A majority of comments emphasized off-highway vehicle (OHV) management, recreation, areas of special designation, and wilderness characteristics. Other issues of high interest include livestock grazing, minerals and energy resources, access to public lands, and social and economic issues. For each public comment, a position-neutral issue was identified. This process was used for all scoping input. The issues identified from comments at public scoping meetings were added to written public scoping comments, internal BLM scoping, and interagency scoping. These issues were used throughout creation of the range of alternatives (see Chapter 2).

Further opportunities for public participation were provided in April 2005 during a data call for information (e.g., route data, resource inventories, and/or condition) and nominations for areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs) and Wild and Scenic Rivers. In January 2006, the public was invited to provide further input in the planning process by commenting on the preliminary ACEC and Wild and Scenic River reports. For each of these requests for comments, the BLM provided at least 30 calendar days for public response as directed by BLM planning regulations (43 CFR 1610.2(e)).

5.5.2 Mailing List

As directed by 43 CFR 1610.2(d), the BLM has established and maintained a list of “individuals and groups known to be interested in or affected by a resource management plan.” This list was initially developed from the Kanab Field Office mailing list and supplemented/updated throughout the planning process. Scoping meeting participants were given the option to be added to the mailing list. In addition, individuals were able to add themselves to the project mailing list by registering on the project website, as well as through requests to be placed on the mailing list by contacting BLM staff. In addition, individuals, organizations, or agencies that included an address in written scoping comments were added to the mailing list.

The mailing list was used during the distribution of planning bulletins and postcards throughout the planning process. Postcards were mailed to the entire list, announcing the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS.

5.5.3 Planning Bulletins

Periodic bulletins and postcards have been developed to keep the public informed of the Kanab RMP planning process. Planning bulletins and postcards provided planning updates to individuals, organizations, government agencies, and tribes on the mailing list. These updates provided information about planning issues and the progress of the planning effort and invited information or comments. Table 5-3 lists the planning bulletins and postcards that were mailed to the mailing list and placed on the project website.

Table 5-3. Planning Bulletins/Postcards

Date Released	Contents
December 2004	Bulletin: Described the general purpose and need of the new RMP, planning process, project schedule, and scoping meetings locations and dates
January 2005	Postcard: Scoping meetings locations and dates
April 2005	Bulletin: Scoping Report availability, results of scoping, request for data, updated planning schedule
December 2005	Bulletin: Results of data collection availability (Analysis of the Management Situation [AMS], Socioeconomic Baseline Report, Mineral Potential Report, Evaluation Report for ACECs, Wild and Scenic Rivers Report), summary of AMS, invitation for public input on ACEC and Wild and Scenic Rivers Reports, new website
October 2007	Postcard: Draft RMP/EIS availability, public comment processes and dates, public meeting locations and dates

5.5.4 Website

The Kanab Draft RMP/EIS project website serves as a virtual repository for documents related to RMP development, including announcements, bulletins, and RMP-related documents. Documents are posted as PDF files to ensure accessibility to the widest range of users. The web address of the project website has been adjusted several times throughout this planning process, as follows:

- <http://www.kanabrm.com> (December 2004–April 2005)
- No project website available (April 2005–December 2005)
- <http://www.ut.blm.gov/landuseplanning/updates.htm> (December 2005–February 2006)
- <http://www.blm.gov/rmp/ut/kanab/> (February 2006–Current).

While the website had to be removed for a period of the planning process because of concerns with DOI Internet security, other opportunities for public comment were made available (through bulletins and a public comment period). In addition, changes in the website location were announced in the regular bulletins.

The initial and current website provides the public with the opportunity to send requests to be added to the project mailing list to receive periodic bulletins and announcements. During the scoping period, the website also provided the opportunity for the general public to submit comments for consideration as part of scoping and to add themselves to the project mailing list to receive periodic newsletters and announcements.

5.6 FUTURE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation efforts will be ongoing throughout the remainder of the Kanab RMP planning process. One substantial part of this effort is the opportunity for members of the public to comment on the Draft RMP/EIS during the specified comment period. The Final EIS will respond to all substantive comments received during the 90-day comment period. The Record of Decision (ROD) and Approved RMP will be issued by the BLM after the release of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, the Governor's Consistency Review, and the Protest Resolution. Please see the Dear Reader Letter at the beginning of this document for information on how to provide comments, as well as the process for public meetings to be held during the comment period.

5.7 LIST OF PREPARERS

Table 5-4 lists those primarily responsible for preparing this Draft RMP/EIS and presents their qualifications.

Table 5-4. List of Preparers

Name	Education	Project Role
Bureau of Land Management		
Daniel Alberts		GIS Analyst
Allysia Angus	B.A., Communications Masters of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning	Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (GSENM) Planning Coordination
Randy Beckstrand	B.S., Range Science	Air Quality, Soil and Water Resources, Riparian, Watersheds, Forestry, Livestock Grazing
Tom Christensen	B.S., Forestry M.S., Forest Recreation	Visual Resources, Wilderness Characteristics, Recreation, Transportation, Wilderness, WSR, Special Management Areas
Lorraine Christian	B.S., Wildlife and Fisheries Biology	NEPA Consistency Lead, Lands and Realty
Lisa Church	B.S., Wildlife and Fisheries Ecology	Riparian, Watersheds, Special Status Species (wildlife), Fish and Wildlife, Special Management Areas, Biological Assessment (BA)
Larry Crutchfield		Public Affairs, Public Outreach
Andrew Dubrasky	B.A., English	GIS Analyst
Shawn Peterson	B.S., Range Management	Soil and Water Resources, Vegetation, Special Status Species (plants), Fire and Fuels Management, Livestock Grazing
Doug Powell	B.S., Geology Graduate Certificate–Hazardous Waste Control	Minerals and Energy, Hazardous Waste Control
Keith Rigtrup	B.A., Economics	Project Manager, Planning Coordination, Socioeconomics
David Sinton	B.S., Forest Management	GIS Analyst
Anne Stanworth		Public Affairs, Public Outreach
Alan Titus	B.S., Geology M.S., Geology Ph.D., Geology	Paleontology
Mike Turaski	B.S., Geology M.S., Physical Geography M.S., Water Resources Management	Soil and Water Resources, Riparian, Watersheds
Hugh Wolfe		Lands and Realty
Matthew Zweifel	B.S., Anthropology M.A., Archeology	Cultural Resources

Name	Education	Project Role
Booz Allen Hamilton		
Erik Anderson	B.S., Civil and Environmental Engineering M.S., (in progress), Environmental Policy and Management	Project Manager, Air Quality, Soil and Water Resources, Riparian, Watersheds, Minerals, Hazardous Materials
Quincy Bahr	B.S., Natural Resources Management and Planning M.S., (in progress), Natural Resources Management and Planning	Assistant Project Manager, Cultural Resources, Livestock Grazing, Paleontology, ACEC, Special Management Areas, Visual Resources
David Baxter	B.A., Regional Geography and History B.A., honors, Political Geography M.A., Economic Geography HED, Education Ph.D. (in progress)	Project Manager, Agency Coordination, Facilitator
Aaron Fergusson	B.A., Anthropology M.A., Anthropology M.B.A., Business Administration	Cultural Resources
Jared Gunnerson	B.A., Environmental Policy M.P.A., Natural Resource Management	Fire and Fuels Management
Joel Hanson	B.A., Geography and Environmental Studies	GIS Analyst
Bryan Klyse	B.A., Social Science (Environment) MESM, Environmental Science and Management	Lands and Realty, Vegetation, Forestry and Woodland Products
Bill Lamb	B.S., Range Management	Senior Public Lands Advisor
Melanie Martin	B.S.A., Environmental Protection M.A.S., Environmental Policy and Management	Wildland Fire Ecology, Vegetation, Forestry and Woodland Products
Pamela Middleton	B.A., Biology M.A.S., Environmental Policy and Management	Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species, BA, Editing
Kasey Pearson	B.A., Environmental Biology	Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species, BA
Al Pierson	B.S., Wildlife Science	Senior Public Lands Advisor
Richard Pinkham	B.A., Geography M.S., Natural Resource Policy and Management	Socioeconomics, Socioeconomic Baseline Report
Dana Purrone	B.A., Environmental Policy B.A., Spanish M.S. (in progress), Environmental Policy and Natural Resource Management	Special Status Species, Fish and Wildlife, NEPA review
Jason Smiley	B.S.E.D., Park Administration M.S., Geography (GIS, Natural Resource Management)	GIS Analyst
Mike Sumner	B.S., Recreation Resource Management	Visual Resources, Transportation, Document Preparation

Name	Education	Project Role
Lloyd Tabing	B.S., Natural Resource Management B.S., Urban Planning M.S., Natural Resource Management	Wilderness Characteristics, Recreation, Transportation, Wilderness, WSR, WSA
Leslie Watson	B.S., Zoology GIS Certification, Penn State, PA	Vegetation, Forestry
Caitlin Willoughby	B.A., Geology (Environmental Science, minor), Hartwick College, NY GIS Certification & Coastal Zone Management Certification, Cape Cod Community College, MA M.L.S., Library and Informational Science, Simmons College, MA GIS Certification, Penn State, PA	GIS Analyst

This page intentionally left blank