

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. Consultation and coordination started with public scoping early in the NEPA process and will continue throughout the course of the B2H Project and potentially through the course of the right-of-way activities. The purpose of the consultation and coordination program is to encourage interaction between the BLM and other federal, state, and local agencies; Native American sovereign tribal governments; and the public. BLM's initiative is to inform the public about the B2H 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, tribal governments, 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 B2H 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, tribal governments, and stakeholders; the scoping process; public review of the Draft EIS; open-house meetings, and preparation of the Final EIS (including interim review by the cooperating agencies).

4.2.1 COOPERATING AGENCIES

The BLM Vale District Office, lead federal agency responsible for the preparation of the EIS under NEPA, invited federal, state, and local agencies whose jurisdiction and/or expertise are relevant to the B2H Project to participate in preparation of the EIS and LUP Amendments. 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 (Section 1.1).

The BLM Agency Interdisciplinary Team and Cooperating Agencies convene via conference call monthly to discuss the status of the B2H Project. In addition, between the Draft and Final EIS, this group convened for two workshops (August and December 2015). The purpose of the August 2015 workshop was to review the comments received on the Draft EIS, review route-variation options recommended as part of comments on the Draft EIS, and review resource data updated since completion of the Draft EIS. The purpose of the December 2015 workshop was to review the alternative routes and results of analyses to be addressed in the Final EIS.

4.2.2 FORMAL CONSULTATION

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

4.2.2.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Section 106 (54 U.S.C. 306108) of the NHPA (54 U.S.C. 300101 et seq.) requires federal agencies to take into account the effect of their undertakings on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Regulations for the implementation of Section 106 are defined in 36 CFR Part 800 – Protection of Historic Properties. These regulations define how federal agencies meet their statutory responsibilities as required under the law. The Section 106 process seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns with the needs of federal undertakings through consultation among the agency official and other parties with an interest in the effects of the undertaking on historic properties (36 CFR 800.1 and 36 CFR 800.2). These parties include the ACHP, SHPOs, THPOs, tribal governments, state and other federal agencies, and individuals or organizations with a demonstrated interest in the undertaking due to their legal or economic relationship to the undertaking or affected properties or their concern with the effects of undertakings on historic properties.

Pursuant to Title 36 CFR Part 800, and as lead federal agency for the undertaking, the BLM has initiated Section 106 consultation with the following agencies, tribal governments, and organizations:

FEDERAL

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District
- Bonneville Power Administration
- Bureau of Reclamation
- Fish and Wildlife Service, Umatilla National Wildlife Refuge
- Forest Service
- National Park Service
 - Ice Age Floods National Geologic Trail at Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area
 - Lewis and Clark Trail Office
 - National Historic Trails System Office
 - National Trust for Historic Preservation

TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

- Burns Paiute Tribe
- Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
- Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR)
- Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon

- Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe
- Nez Perce Tribe (including the Joseph Band of the Nez Perce)
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation
- Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation
- Yakama Nation

STATE

- Idaho State Historic Preservation Office
- Oregon Department of Energy
- Oregon Historic Trails Advisory Council
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office
- Washington State Historic Preservation Office

COUNTY

- Baker County
- Morrow County
- Union County

LOCAL

- Baker City

ORGANIZATIONS

- Halt Idaho Power
- Ice Age Floods Institute
- Ice Age Floods Institute, Columbia Gorge Chapter
- Ice Age Floods Institute, Lake Lewis Chapter
- Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, Headquarters and Washington and Oregon Chapters
- Lewis and Clark Trust
- Malheur County Historical Society
- Oregon-California Trail Association Oregon and Idaho Chapters
- Poison Creek Neighborhood Group

Note that the Navy is responsible for consultation on lands administered by the Navy and would lead consultation, if needed, for sensitive historic properties that could be affected on the NWSTF Boardman.

Parties to Section 106 consultation also include several members of the public who possess a demonstrable interest in historic properties located within the B2H Project area and have petitioned the BLM in writing to participate in consultation.

After initiating Section 106 consultation, the BLM invited all consulting parties to attend a 1-day meeting in La Grande, Oregon, to review the scope and status of the undertaking, and apprise parties of the agency's ongoing efforts to identify historic properties that may be affected by the B2H Project. The meeting—held on August 16, 2011, at Eastern Oregon University—involved representatives from agencies, contractors, and consulting parties, and resulted in the formation of a consulting party workgroup to collaborate on development of a Programmatic Agreement to provide for the phased identification, evaluation, and effects assessment for historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR 800.15(b).

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

Between September 17, 2011, and September 10, 2014, the consulting party workgroup met via webinar and teleconference on 34 occasions to develop sections of the B2H Project Programmatic Agreement. The draft Programmatic Agreement was included in the Draft EIS (Appendix G) for public review and comments, and the final Programmatic Agreement is included in this Final EIS in Appendix I. The BLM has continued to receive comments on and refine the draft B2H Project Programmatic Agreement from consulting parties. The B2H Project Programmatic Agreement must be fully executed before issuance of the Record of Decision.

The B2H Project Programmatic Agreement specifies three groups of consulting parties to the Section 106 process: (1) signatories, (2) invited signatories, and (3) concurring parties. Signatories have formal responsibilities for execution of one or more elements of the regulations under 36 CFR Part 800. Invited signatories participate in the execution of the terms of the B2H Project Programmatic Agreement but do not possess regulatory responsibilities. Concurring parties are individuals, organizations, agencies, or tribal governments that have participated in consultation and maintain an active interest in the B2H Project. Concurrence is sought to indicate general agreement with the terms of the B2H Project Programmatic Agreement; however, a concurring party's signature on the B2H Project Programmatic Agreement is not equivalent with endorsement of the B2H Project.

4.2.2.2 GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT AND SECTION 106 TRIBAL CONSULTATION

The United States has a unique legal relationship with sovereign tribal governments, as established by the U.S. Constitution, treaties, executive orders, federal statutes, court decisions, and federal and tribal-government policies. Since the formation of the union, the United States has recognized tribes as domestic dependent nations under its protection. The federal government has enacted a number of regulations that establish and define trust relationship with tribes.

As sovereign nations, federally recognized tribal governments retain legal rights and benefits with respect to their relationship with the U.S. Government. Many of the rights were reserved in treaties, executive orders, or statutes. This relationship is founded on the U.S. Government's trust responsibilities to safeguard tribal sovereignty and self-determination, as well as tribal lands, assets, and resources reserved by treaty and other federally recognized rights. Federal agencies are required by both statute and regulation to consult with tribal governments on a government-to-government basis on federal actions or undertakings that may affect "trust assets," including cultural and natural resources, of concern to the tribal governments on federal land. These statutes include, but are not limited to, the AIRFA, ARPA, NAGPRA, NEPA, NHPA, and RFRA.

Executive and secretarial orders further establish the relationships between federal agencies and tribal governments. These include Executive Orders 13007 (Indian Sacred Sites), 13084 (Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments), and 13175 (Consultation with Indian Tribal Governments); Secretarial Orders 3175 (Departmental Responsibilities for Indian Trust Resources) and 3206 (American Indian Tribal Rights and the ESA); and executive memoranda issued in September 2004 (Government-to-Government Relationship with Tribal Governments) and October 2009 (Tribal Consultation). A more complete list of the regulatory requirements is identified in Section 3.2.14.1.

Government-to-government consultation involves the process of seeking, discussing, and considering tribal governments' views on policies, undertakings, and decisions such as environmental review of the proposed B2H Project. Government-to-government consultation is guided by BLM Manual Handbook H-8120-1, *Guidelines for Conducting Tribal Consultation* (BLM 2004); by the provisions of Secretarial Order 3317 (Department of the Interior Policy on Consultation with Indian Tribes); and the Department of the Interior Policy on Consultation with Indian Tribes transmitted through BLM Instruction Memorandum No. 2012-062 (BLM 2012), which specifies meaningful direct involvement of the agency official with delegated authority for actions and conduct of consultation within the context of ongoing relationships involving regularly recurring meetings where appropriate.

In letters dated August 21, 2008, the BLM formally initiated consultation with eight tribal governments that previously have expressed connection to lands associated with the B2H Project area to inform them of the B2H Project and to inquire about their interest in continuing government-to-government consultation. The contacted tribal governments are as follows:

- Burns Paiute Tribe
- Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
- Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation of Oregon
- Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe
- Nez Perce Tribe (including the Joseph Band of the Nez Perce)
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation
- Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation

Subsequently, on May 4, 2011, a revised scoping report was mailed to the aforementioned eight tribal governments, the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, and the following tribal governments:

- Yakama Nation
- Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians
- Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
- Klamath Tribe
- Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians
- Coquille Indian Tribe
- Puyallup Tribe
- Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians
- Kalispel Tribe
- Fort Bidwell Indian Community
- Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
- Spokane Tribe
- Samish Indian Nation

Consultation generally has involved formal letters and submission of material via U.S. Postal Service Certified Mail, with follow-up telephone contact. The venue for government-to-government consultation for the B2H Project has followed the established form of contact preferred by each tribe. Appendix A provides a record of government-to-government consultation activities for the B2H Project.

Two tribal governments, the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation and the CTUIR, have indicated regular meetings as their preferred form of consultation on the B2H Project.

Government-to-government consultation is taking place between the BLM and the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation through third-party-facilitated ad hoc Wings and Roots meetings, held at the BLM Boise District Office or BLM Idaho State Office. The Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation provide their concerns about the B2H Project and comments on work products (such as the Programmatic Agreement and associated plans, Draft EIS, draft Final EIS) directly to the BLM at these meetings. Although the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation have participated in consultation on the development of the B2H Project Programmatic Agreement, they have indicated that their concerns about the B2H Project are much broader than the topics under the scope of NHPA consultation. They expressed concern about the limited definition of “historic properties” under Section 106 and developed a separate Memorandum of Understanding agreement document with the BLM Idaho State Office (signed in 2015) to address their concerns about B2H Project impacts on cultural resources considered important to the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation.

The CTUIR have provided comments both through the scoping process and through formal government-to-government consultation under Section 106 of the NHPA. Consultation with the CTUIR

has occurred through face-to-face and conference-call meetings. Through consultation, the CTUIR provide comments on work products ((such as the Programmatic Agreement and associated plans, Draft EIS, draft Final EIS) and have expressed concerns. Concerns include the level of effort (pedestrian inventory of 15 percent random sample of lands within the area of potential effects) employed to identify historic properties, as well as the general time frame for responding to their concerns about B2H Project communications and the timeliness of response to their comments on documents.

Note that the Navy is responsible for government-to-government tribal consultation on lands administered by the Navy and would lead consultation, if needed, for sensitive historic properties that could be affected on the NWSTF Boardman in Segment 1 of the B2H Project.

4.2.2.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Section 7 of the ESA, as amended, calls for interagency cooperation to conserve federally listed species and designated critical habitats. Pursuant to Section 7, federal agencies are required to consult with the USFWS, the NOAA Fisheries (formerly, the National Marine Fisheries Service), or both on all projects that may affect federally listed threatened, endangered, and candidate species (including plants, fish, and wildlife and their critical habitats). In accordance with these regulations, the USFWS has participated in B2H Project-related discussions and meetings even before the initiation of preparation of the EIS.

Preliminary coordination for the B2H Project began with a biological resources and Level 1 Team meeting held in August 2008.

The NOAA Fisheries was invited to B2H Project meetings beginning in July 2012 when it became clear that the proposed B2H Project may affect species and their critical habitats under its jurisdiction.

The USFWS lists of endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species and designated critical habitats in Oregon and Idaho counties where B2H Project activities may occur were periodically reviewed and B2H Project data have been updated, as appropriate.

The most recent review of these lists was completed in March 2016. Coordination between the BLM (including cooperating agencies) and USFWS and NOAA Fisheries has continued throughout the development of the EIS and has included meetings, conference calls, letters, and other correspondence. Initial coordination was carried through by the Biological Resource Work Group, and in July 2014, the BLM established the Biological Resources Task Group (BRTG) composed of the biologists from the BLM, USFS, Reclamation, USFWS, and state wildlife agencies. The BRTG meets via conference call once a month to discuss the status of the B2H Project and key biological resource issues related to the B2H Project, as well as the approach to address these issues.

In early 2016, the USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, BLM, USFS, USBR, USACE, and BPA (federal agencies with the authority and responsibility to perform certain actions associated with the B2H Project) entered into a Consultation Agreement. The Agreement addresses interagency coordination for the affirmative

conservation and recovery of listed species under Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA. Section 7(a)(1) directs all federal agencies to use their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of the ESA by “carrying out programs for the conservation and recovery of listed species.” Pursuant to Section 7(a)(1), the Agreement clarifies agency roles during consultation under Section 7(a)(2) for the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the Proposed Action on listed species, species proposed for listing, and their associated designated or proposed critical habitat. In coordination with appropriate state natural resource management agencies that have trust authority for nonlisted species, the Agreement also speaks to interagency coordination for the conservation of, and assessment of effects on, candidate species that may be affected by the B2H Project.

Two biological assessments will be prepared to evaluate the effects of the selected transmission line route on species listed under the ESA—one evaluating the effects on terrestrial and inland aquatic species will be submitted to the USFWS, and one evaluating the effects on anadromous fish species (those species that migrate inland from the ocean to spawn) will be submitted to NOAA Fisheries. Submittal of the biological assessments for species with a “may adversely affect” determination will initiate the formal Section 7 consultation process.

Note that the Navy is responsible for Section 7 consultation on lands administered by the Navy and would lead consultation, if needed, for ESA-listed species on the NWSTF Boardman in Segment 1.

4.3 SCOPING PROCESS

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

4.3.1 2008 SCOPING

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

4.3.2 APPLICANT-SPONSORED COMMUNITY ADVISORY PROCESS

Based on feedback from the public and local, state, and federal agencies during the 2008 scoping period, the Applicant requested the BLM to suspend processing the right-of-way application so that the Applicant could conduct additional siting studies for the B2H Project. The Applicant initiated a

Community Advisory Process in March 2009. Through the Community Advisory Process, the Applicant engaged communities in the B2H Project area to help site the proposed B2H Project transmission line. The Applicant launched the Community Advisory Process by inviting private landowners, local officials, business leaders, and other stakeholders to participate on Project Advisory Teams. Federal agency representatives did not participate directly in the Community Advisory Process or the Project Advisory Teams, because the Community Advisory Process was outside the NEPA scoping process, but they did participate in an information meeting to share information about federal agency roles and responsibilities. The Project Advisory Teams met from May 2009 through May 2010 to identify community issues and concerns, to evaluate a range of possible routes, and to recommend proposed and alternative routes. In addition to hosting approximately 30 Project Advisory Teams meetings, the Applicant hosted two rounds of open houses for the public to provide feedback and recommendations on the process.

The Project Advisory Teams members initially proposed 49 different route segments (refer to Chapter 1, Map 1-2), which were evaluated by the Applicant and its consultants based on permitting difficulty, constructability, and mitigation costs. As a result of the routing analysis, the Applicant identified three potential alternative routes that met its permitting, construction, and mitigation requirements.

Based on feedback and recommendations from the Project Advisory Teams, the Applicant revised the location of its proposed route and, in June 2010, submitted a revised right-of-way application to the BLM. The most significant changes proposed in the revised application include the following:

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

A more detailed explanation of the changes is available on the B2H Project website:
http://www.boardmantohemingway.com/faq_routing.aspx.

4.3.3 2010 SCOPING

In response to the revised right-of-way applications (Idaho Power Company 2010), the BLM and USFS initiated additional scoping pursuant to the NEPA. The BLM published a revised Notice of Intent on July 27, 2010, which reinitiated scoping for the B2H Project under a new scoping comment period of July 27 through September 27, 2010 (BLM and USFS 2010). The BLM, USFS, and ODOE hosted eight scoping meetings in August 2010. The meetings were held in Marsing, Idaho; Ontario, Oregon; Baker City, Oregon; Pendleton, Oregon; Boardman, Oregon; La Grande, Oregon; Mount Vernon, Oregon; and Burns, Oregon. A total of 241 people attended the 2010 meetings. At the request of the public, BLM agreed to include comments generated during the Community Advisory Process as scoping comments for the NEPA process. A Revised Scoping Report was completed in April 2011 (BLM 2011) and is available on the B2H Project website: <http://www.boardmantohemingway.com/documents.aspx>.

4.4 INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

Initiation of the EIS process and the public scoping meetings were announced through the *Federal Register*, notification letters, media announcements, community calendar notifications, and the B2H Project website.

4.4.1 FEDERAL REGISTER

The 2008 public scoping process began with the publication of a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* on September 12, 2008. Given substantial changes to the alternative routes resulting from the Applicant-sponsored Community Advisory Process, the BLM published a revised Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* on July 27, 2010, to announce the reinitiation of the NEPA scoping process to solicit public comments.

4.4.2 NOTIFICATION LETTERS TO ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

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

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

4.4.3 MEDIA ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNITY CALENDAR NOTIFICATIONS

The ODOE, BLM, and USFS prepared news releases for both the 2008 and 2010 scoping efforts to introduce the B2H Project, announce the scoping period, and publicize the scoping meetings and their respective locations. The news releases were posted on the BLM Vale District website. Legal notices and display advertisements were published in 11 local newspapers in 2008 and 15 local newspapers in 2010.

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

4.4.4 B2H PROJECT WEBSITE

The B2H Project website (<http://www.boardmantohemingway.com>) provides a central location for public information from BLM and other agencies. The B2H Project website includes:

- B2H Project status updates
- B2H Project schedule
- Description of the proposed B2H Project
- B2H Project documents, fact sheets, and maps

- Public participation opportunities
- Overview of the NEPA process
- Overview of the ODOE transmission line siting process
- Public Newswire, a newsletter providing updates about the B2H Project and the Applicant

4.5 PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The BLM published a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS for public review and comment in the *Federal Register* on December 19, 2014. The EPA also published a Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register* the same day, which initiated a 90-day public review and comments period. The Draft EIS was posted to the B2H Project website (<http://www.boardmantoohemingway.com>), and electronic copies on CD-ROMs were produced for distribution. Approximately 43 paper copies and 439 electronic copies of the Draft EIS were distributed to agencies required to review the Draft EIS and to other agencies; tribal, state, and local governments; organizations; public reading rooms; and individuals that requested copies. The availability of the Draft EIS; deadline for public comments; and locations, dates, and times of public open houses to solicit and accept comments on the Draft EIS were announced on the B2H Project webpage, in paid newspaper notices, media releases, and a newsletter and email sent to all parties on the B2H Project mailing list including potentially affected landowners, agencies, stakeholders, and other interested parties.

During the 90-day comment period, the BLM held public open houses to receive comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIS. Table 4-1 is a list of the dates, locations, and numbers of people attending each meeting.

| Date | Meeting Location | Attendance |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| January 5, 2015 | Boardman, Oregon | 47 |
| January 6, 2015 | Pendleton, Oregon | 24 |
| January 7, 2015 | La Grande, Oregon | 61 |
| January 8, 2015 | Baker City, Oregon | 60 |
| January 9, 2015 | Durkee, Oregon | 30 |
| January 12, 2015 | Ontario, Oregon | 62 |
| January 13, 2015 | Marsing, Idaho | 23 |
| Total | | 307 |

The comment period ended March 19, 2015. The BLM received 382 submittals containing comments from federal agencies, tribal governments, state and local agencies, public and private organizations; and individuals.

4.6 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

All written and oral comments on the Draft EIS received during the 90-day-long period were compiled and analyzed. In the 382 comment submittals, responses were prepared for approximately 2,150 substantive comments. Comments received and responses to substantive comments are provided in Appendix K. Also in response to comments on the Draft EIS, some resource data were updated; sections of the Final EIS were clarified and/or expanded to incorporate additional explanation, and recommended route-variation options were evaluated and addressed.

The BLM has published a *Federal Register* Notice of Availability of this Final EIS, which provides information about the B2H Project and the 30-day availability period for the Final EIS and concurrent 30-day protest period for the Proposed LUP Amendments and filing instructions. Also, the BLM is providing a concurrent 60-day review period to the Governor of Oregon, the state in which land-use plan amendments are proposed to ensure consistency with state and local plans, policies, and programs. The availability and protest period and Governor’s consistency review occur simultaneously. Any responses from the Governor on consistency as well as protests on land-use-plan amendments must be resolved before RODs are issued.

The BLM and USFS will each issue a ROD and other affected federal agencies with decisions to make may each issue a ROD summarizing the findings and decisions regarding the Agency Preferred Alternative for the B2H Project and its determination regarding compliance with the NEPA and other regulations. Also, the RODs will document the management decisions made regarding applicable amendments to land-use plans. If an action alternative is selected, depending on the route selected for the proposed transmission line, other potentially affected federal agencies may tier to the analysis in this EIS in issuing decisions and similar authorizations.

4.7 PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

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

4.7.1 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

| Oregon State Office | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Al Doelker, Fisheries Program Leader Glenn Frederick, Biologist Erin McConnell, Weed Specialist | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leslie Frewing, Planner Stewart Allen, Socioeconomic Specialist Scott Lightcap, Fish Biologist |
| Idaho State Office | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul Makela, Wildlife Biologist Robin Fehlau, Recreation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anna Halford, Botanist, Threatened and Endangered Plants Eric Mayes, Planning and Environmental Coordination |
| Vale District Office | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Susan Fritts, Botanist, Threatened and Endangered Plants June Galloway, Biologist Donald N. Gonzalez, District Manager Brent Grasty, Planning and Environmental Coordinator | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marissa Russell, GIS Specialist Lynne Silva, Weed Specialist Renee Straub, Project Coordinator Jennifer Theisen, Archaeologist Brian Watts, Fire Ecologist |

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linus Meyer, Hydrology, Soils Richard Pastor, Hydrology, Fisheries Kari Points, Outdoor Recreation Planner | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Naomi Wilson, Natural Resource Specialist Diane Pritchard, Archaeologist (former) John Zancanella, Archaeologist, Paleontology Support (former) |
| Boise District Office | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lara Douglas, District Manager Jeremy Bluma, Realty Specialist | |
| Baker Field Office | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Katherine Coddington, Archaeologist |
| Owyhee Field Office | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kelli Barnes, Archaeologist Ryan Homan, Outdoor Recreation Planner and Visual Resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brad Jost, Wildlife Biologist |
| Northwest Region | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brent Breithaup, Northwest Regional Paleontologist, Wyoming State Office | |
| Washington Office | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tamara Gertsch, National Project Manager John McCarthy, Landscape Architect | |
| National Transmission Support Team | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jenna Gaston, Cultural Resources Specialist, Idaho State Office Jason Sutter, Biologist, Idaho State Office | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scott Whitesides, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Utah State Office |

4.7.2 U.S. FOREST SERVICE

| | |
|--|---|
| Wallowa-Whitman National Forest | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tom Armon, Engineer Arlene Blumton, Project Coordinator Sarah Brandy, Fish Biologist Sarah Crump, Archaeologist Dan Ermovick, Recreation Specialist Bill Gamble, District Ranger Aric Johnson, Range Conservationist Chuck Oliver, Deputy Forest Supervisor Donna Mattson, Landscape Architect | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mike Montgomery, Realty Specialist Tom Montoya, Forest Supervisor Laura Navarrete, Wildlife Biologist Dea Nelson, Environmental Coordinator Mark Penninger, Wildlife Biologist Matthew Rathvone, Silviculturist Joe Vacirca, Fish Biologist 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 Michael Hampton, Environmental Coordinator (former) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elaine Rybak, Wildlife (former) Jim Sauser, Special Uses Jeff Walker, Heritage Program Doug Young, Environmental Coordinator (current) |

4.7.3 CONSULTANT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

| Name | Education | Involvement |
|--|--|---|
| Environmental Planning Group, LLC (EPG) | | |
| Anna Allen | BA, English | Editor, document management |
| Pamela Blackmore | BLA, Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning | Land use and agriculture |
| Louise Brown | BS, Administrative Systems | Editor, document management |
| Ivan Contreras | BLA, Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning | Visual resources, national historic trails |
| Kim Degutis, PWS | BS, Environmental Studies BS, Marine Science | Wetland and water resources |
| Matthew Dickinson | MS, Ecology BS, Biology | Wildlife resources |
| Michael Doyle | MLA, Landscape Architecture BA, Environmental Design | Senior technical review |
| Megan Dunford | MLA, Landscape Architecture BA, Advertising and Interpersonal Communications | Land use and recreation |
| Adrien Elseroad | MS, Forestry BS, Natural Resources | Wildlife resources; technical review of vegetation, water, and fish resources |
| Nate Ferguson | BLA, Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning | Land use, mitigation planning |
| Lindsay Fenner | MA, Anthropology/Archaeology BS, Anthropology | Cultural and historical resources |
| Naia George | MS, Anthropology (Archaeology/Physical Anthropology) BS, Anthropology | Cultural and historical resources |
| Peter Goodwin | BA, Biology with Plant Ecology Focus | Vegetation and special status plants |
| Caree Griffin | AAS, Drafting | Graphics, visual simulations |
| Dana Holmes | BA, Environmental Policy and Planning MA, Environmental Policy and Management | Land use and lands with wilderness characteristics, transportation |
| Craig Johnson | BS, Landscape Architecture | Visual resources, national historic trails |
| David Kahrs | MS, Wildlife Conservation and Management BS, Organismic Biology | Fire management, timber management |
| Don Kelly | MUEP, Urban and Environmental Planning BA, Anthropology BA, Philosophy | Land use |
| Matt Martin | MS, Urban and Regional Planning BA, Geography | Geographic information systems |
| Sarah Nelson | MLA, Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning BA, Anthropology | Geographic information systems |
| Amanda O'Connor | MS, Conservation Studies BA, Environmental Biology | Senior technical review, NEPA and planning coordination, mitigation planning |

| Name | Education | Involvement |
|--|---|---|
| Environmental Planning Group, LLC (EPG) | | |
| Mike Pasenko | MS, Quaternary Sciences Program BA, Anthropology | Earth resources, paleontology |
| Kevin Rauhe | BLA, Landscape Architecture | Visual resources, national historic trails |
| Michael Siegel | MCRP, City and Regional Planning BA, Psychology | Senior review, land use |
| Chris Smith | MLA, Landscape Architecture BA, History | Project coordination |
| Cindy Smith | BS, Liberal Arts and Sciences | Project management, senior review, NEPA and planning, mitigation planning |
| Jennifer Streeter | MS, Geography BS, Geography | Geographic information systems |
| Johanna Tietze | BS, Environmental Studies | Document production |
| Nikki Wallenta | BS, Land-Use Planning | Recreation and potential congressional designations |
| Heather Weymouth | MS, American Studies (Anthropology/History/Folklore) BS, Integrated Studies (Anthropology/Geology/Archaeology) | Cultural and historical resources |
| Andrew T. Yentsch | MS, Anthropology (Archaeology/Evolutionary Ecology) BA, History | Cultural and historical resources |

| Subconsultants | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Pinyon Environmental | | |
| Jenn Dobb | MS, Agriculture and Resource Economics BA, Economics | Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice |
| Lisa McDonald | PhD, Mineral Economics MS, Mineral Economics BS, Earth Science | Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice |
| Parametrix | | |
| Cyrus Bullock | BS, Environmental Science | Fish Resources |
| William Hall | BS, Biology | Fish Resources |

This page intentionally left blank.