



## Chapter 4: Consultation, Coordination, and Preparers



# CHAPTER 4: CONSULTATION, COORDINATION, AND PREPARERS

## HISTORY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The public planning process for the *Restoration of the Mariposa Grove of Giant Sequoias / Final Environmental Impact Statement (Mariposa Grove FEIS)* helped the NPS to understand and fully consider the interests of the public. Individuals, other public agencies, traditionally associated Indian tribes and groups, organizations, and businesses identified various issues and opportunities regarding the *Mariposa Grove FEIS* as part of this comprehensive process. This section describes the public involvement process and summarizes the public comments received during public scoping and review of the *Mariposa Grove Draft EIS*.

### PROJECT SCOPING

The purpose of scoping is to conduct an early and open process to identify issues and concerns related to the planning process and to determine the scope of issues to be addressed in the environmental analysis. The National Park Service (NPS) public scoping period for the *Mariposa Grove Plan* was open from August 31, 2011, through February 3, 2012. The NPS held public open houses on August 31, September 28, and December 7, 2011 and January 25, 2012, to inform interested parties about the proposed project and to solicit comments from members of the public in order to understand the spectrum of concerns, interests, and issues that should be considered in the planning process. The park also conducted a public site visit at the Mariposa Grove on October 14, 2011. Approximately 20 interested individuals attended.

The NPS accepted public comments by mail, fax, email, through the Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) system, and on comment forms available at public scoping meetings. During the public scoping period, the park received 43 letters from 41 individuals and 2 organizations. Analysis of these letters identified 126 discrete substantive comments, from which 15 general concern statements were generated. All comments received during the scoping period were carefully read and considered, and are now part of the administrative record for this project. The public scoping letters and a report summarizing comments are available on the PEPC database at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/mariposagrove>.

On June 27, 2012, the park held its monthly open house in Yosemite Valley and shared results of the Choosing By Advantages (CBA) workshop for the *Mariposa Grove Plan* with the public. Design drawings and scoring for each preliminary alternative were presented, and input received led to the reconsideration of some alternatives.

During this period, internal scoping was conducted in consultation with NPS managers and staff, traditionally associated American Indian tribes and groups, affected state and federal agencies, and local and state governments.

### PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE *MARIPOSA GROVE DRAFT EIS*

The *Mariposa Grove Draft EIS* was available to the public, federal, state, and local agencies and organizations for a 61-day public review period from March 8, 2013 through May 7, 2013. A Notice of Availability was published in the *Federal Register* on March 8, 2013. Electronic copies of the *Mariposa Grove Draft EIS* were posted to the park's website at

[www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/mgrove.htm](http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/mgrove.htm) and hard copies and/or CDs of the document were distributed to individuals that requested them, as well as to congressional delegations, state and local elected officials, federal agencies, traditionally associated American Indian tribes and groups, organizations and local businesses, public libraries, and the news media. The NPS provided notice of the plan's availability for public comment via a press release distributed to a wide variety of news media and announcements placed on the park's website, online newsletters, printed newsletters, and local public libraries.

Essential elements of the *Mariposa Grove Draft EIS* were presented by park staff at a webinar on April 9, 2013. A recording of the webinar is available at <http://yose.webex.com>.

In addition, park staff hosted two public meetings focused on the *Mariposa Grove Draft EIS*. These meetings consisted of an open house, presentation, and an opportunity to discuss the plan with park staff members and to provide comment. The public meeting schedule was as follows:

April 12, 2013: Public Meeting at Tenaya Lodge, Fish Camp, California

April 24, 2013: Yosemite Open House in the Visitor Center Auditorium, Yosemite Valley, California

Public comment letters were received through PEPC website at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/mariposagrove>, by email at [yoseplanning@nps.gov](mailto:yoseplanning@nps.gov), and by U.S. mail. The full text of public comment letters received can be viewed on the project website at [http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/mgrove\\_documents.htm](http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/mgrove_documents.htm). Personal information included with the comments (e.g., names and contact information) is redacted in the correspondence posted online to protect authors' privacy.

During the 61-day public comment period, the park received 334 public comment letters. One comment letter was from a state agency, five were from organizations, one business, and the remainder originated from unaffiliated individuals. An analysis of these letters identified 356 discrete comments (excluding form letters), from which 68 general concern statements were generated. The results of the public comment analysis process and NPS responses to substantive public comments are provided in Appendix C. The changes to the alternatives under consideration in this *EIS* resulting from public comment are summarized in Chapter 2.

## **AGENCY CONSULTATION**

### **U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, REGULATORY BOARD**

The Clean Water Act (Public Law 92-500) requires that federal land agencies consult with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps) regarding wetlands located in or near proposed projects. The NPS is consulting with the Army Corps regarding the *Mariposa Grove FEIS* in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) and Section 10 (33 U.S.C. 403) of the Rivers and Harbors Act.

Also under Section 404, permit approval is required for projects that may result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. This includes all navigable waters, their tributaries, impoundments of these waters, and adjacent wetlands. Examples of Section 404 activities include infrastructure development, road fills, and riprap. Some actions proposed in the *Mariposa Grove FEIS* may require permits for the discharge of fill material. The NPS will work with the Army Corps to obtain required Section 404 permits prior to implementing any such actions.

Under Section 10, permit approval is required for the placement of structures in or over, or work in or over, navigable waters of the United States which affects their course, location, condition, or capacity. The NPS will ensure that all Army Corps permit approvals associated with the *Mariposa Grove FEIS* are in place prior to implementation.

The NPS provided a copy of the *Mariposa Grove Draft EIS* to the Army Corps as part of the consultation process, and received a comment letter on the plan in support of the alternative that restores and protects the most waters of the United States. The NPS is working with the Army Corps to ensure that wetland maps associated with the *Mariposa Grove FEIS* are verified per Army Corps standards, prior to submittal of permit applications.

## **U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE**

The Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 USC 1531 et seq.) requires federal agencies to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by the agency does not jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or critical habitat. The NPS originally obtained a list of federally listed endangered and threatened species that may be present in the South Entrance area and Mariposa Grove from the USFWS on November 14, 2011 and compared this list to park records. The list was updated regularly and used as the basis for the special status species analysis in this EIS. On March 15, 2012, the park contacted the USFWS regarding the candidate species Pacific fisher and Sierra Nevada Red Frog regarding timing of possible listing under the Endangered Species Act. On May 3, 2012 the park entered into informal consultation with the USFWS for this project to develop appropriate mitigation measures and proactive habitat improvements. The NPS provided the USFWS with a set of draft mitigation measures to protect the Pacific fisher on June 24, 2013. The USFWS concurred that the measures were adequate on June 25, 2013 (see Appendix E). Should the Pacific fisher be proposed for listing or listed under the Endangered Species Act during implementation of the Mariposa Grove project, the NPS will continue conferencing or consultation with the USFWS as appropriate.

## **CALIFORNIA STATE OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

The cultural resources investigations and reports for the project were conducted in accordance with the Section 106 process under 36 CFR Part 800, "Protection of Historic Properties," the regulations that implement Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). A site visit in October 2011 was conducted with the staff of the California State Office of Historic Preservation during the scoping period for the project.

The NPS initiated consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in Sacramento regarding the proposed undertaking at the Mariposa Grove and South Entrance with a letter sent on September 30, 2011. On April 11, 2012, the park sent a letter requesting concurrence for a determination of ineligibility for four archeological sites in the study area. On June 26, 2012 the park sent a letter requesting concurrence on the amendment to the Mariposa Grove consensus determination of eligibility. On February 5, 2013, the NPS received a letter from SHPO that stated concurrence with the boundaries of the Area of Potential Effects, or APE; and the recommended eligibilities, as well as agreement that historic properties have been sufficiently identified. The NPS is developing a draft Memorandum of Agreement with the SHPO as part of consultation for this project. A draft version is included in Appendix G. The final Memorandum of Agreement will be included in the Record of Decision for the Mariposa Grove FEIS. The SHPO will be a signatory on the Memorandum of Agreement.

NPS is consulting with the SHPO under the four-step process outlined in 36 CFR Part 800 rather than an existing programmatic agreement. The NPS will continue to communicate with the SHPO through design and construction of the project as needed. The NPS will serve as the lead agency on behalf of the Army Corps, regarding future consultation with the SHPO regarding permits.

## **STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD AND CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD**

The NPS works with state and local government agencies to maintain the highest possible water quality standards and to take action to restore substandard waters, as directed by NPS Management Policies 2006 and Director's Order 84, Public Health (2004).

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) are the regulatory boards within California's Environmental Protection Agency that derive their authority from Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and Section 13020 of the California Water Code. The SWRCB allocates rights to the use of surface water and, along with the regional boards, is charged with protecting surface, ground, and coastal waters throughout the state. The RWQCB issues permits that govern and restrict the amount of pollutants discharged into the ground or surface water, which includes regulating storm water during construction activities.

Under the Clean Water Act's Section 401, every applicant for a federal permit or license for any activity that may result in a discharge to a water body must obtain State Water Quality Certification that the proposed activity will comply with state water quality standards, if an activity would result in a discharge to a water body.

Yosemite National Park is under the jurisdiction of Regional Board 5, Central Valley, and obtains any necessary permits and/or certifications for construction activities from that board. If required, the NPS would file a Notice of Intent to discharge storm water and prepare and implement provisions of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to control run-off from construction activities. The NPS provided a copy of the *Mariposa Grove Draft EIS* to the RWQCB, who in turn notified the NPS that they will provide input as part of future permitting processes, as necessary.

## **AMERICAN INDIAN CONSULTATION**

Yosemite National Park consults with seven traditionally associated American Indian tribes and groups that have ancestral connections to Yosemite National Park: the American Indian Council of Mariposa County, Inc. (aka Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation), Bishop Paiute Tribe, Bridgeport Indian Colony, Mono Lake Kutzadika'a Tribe, North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians of California, Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians, and the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians. The NPS initiated consultation with these tribes and groups in a letter dated October 19, 2011 (with a subsequent correction letter dated November 28, 2011).

Tribal consultation for this project has included numerous meetings and tribal site visits. In addition to consultation meetings with individual tribal groups, all traditionally associated tribes and groups were invited to:

- an informational project scoping meeting on January 5, 2012. Representatives from the American Indian Council of Mariposa County, Inc. and the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians attended.

- a site visit to the Mariposa Grove on January 11, 2012. Representatives from the American Indian Council of Mariposa County and the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians attended.
- a site visit on May 22, 2012. Representatives from the American Indian Council of Mariposa County, the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, and the Picayune Rancheria of Chukchansi Indians attended.
- a site visit on April 2, 2013. Representatives from the American Indian Council of Mariposa County, the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, and the North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians of California attended.
- a site visit on July 10, 2013. Representatives from the American Indian Council of Mariposa County, the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, the North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians of California, and the Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians attended.

The Mariposa Grove Restoration Plan was also discussed at the All Tribes meeting in Lee Vining on July 12, 2013.

Throughout the tribal consultation process, traditionally associated tribes and groups brought forward a range of issues, concerns, and proposed actions, including (but not limited to) the following:

- Protect traditionally significant archeological sites;
- Remove the gift shop from the Mariposa Grove and restore the area to protect archeological resources;
- Avoid removing black oaks;
- Avoid impacts to mature trees;
- Avoid shifting impacts to previously undisturbed areas;
- Consider elevated trails to minimize effects on the sequoia roots;
- Retain access to Wawona Point for tribal traditional cultural practices;
- Enhance picnicking opportunities;
- Minimize impacts of restrooms in the lower Grove area (consider keeping vault toilets);
- Provide opportunities for Native American youth to participate in project implementation;
- Reduce the scale of the parking lots to lessen impacts on resources by keeping shuttle operation in Wawona; and
- Include information about Native American connections to the Mariposa Grove in interpretive components.

The NPS has worked with the tribes and groups to integrate these proposed actions into the project, and strongly considered these issues and concerns throughout the development of the alternatives. Under all alternatives, the gift shop would be carefully removed from the archeological site that it was constructed on in the lower Grove area. Plans for developing a shuttle staging area in the lower Grove area were also modified between the *Draft* and *Final EIS* to ensure protection of archeological sites, black oaks and other mature trees, where feasible. Elevated trails (including boardwalks) are part of the design of all new proposed accessible trails. Access to Wawona Point for tribal gatherings

would continue. Trailside interpretive components to emphasize Native American connections to the Mariposa Grove would be focused within the sequoia grove. The NPS is actively pursuing opportunities to engage American Indian youth in project implementation, particularly in trail construction.

The NPS minimized the size of the South Entrance parking lot to the extent possible to meet the goals of the plan. Alternatives 2 through 4 in the EIS do not leave the large shuttle operation from Wawona to the Mariposa Grove, as proposed by some traditionally associated tribal groups. Rather, the shuttle operation from Wawona would be substantially reduced, as more parking would be available closer to the Grove at the South Entrance. This will reduce congestion and roadside parking in Wawona and eliminate backtracking (e.g., visitors who drive to the Grove from Yosemite Valley or the South Entrance often find the lot at the Grove or South Entrance full and then have to drive to Wawona to park and then take the shuttle to the Grove).

The NPS will continue to work with traditionally associated American Indian tribes and groups throughout project design, implementation, and development of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the SHPO. The MOA will include stipulations to avoid, minimize and mitigate adverse effects to historic properties with traditional cultural and religious significance to American Indian tribes. The Draft MOA is in Appendix G; the signed final MOA will be a part of the Record of Decision for the final Mariposa Grove EIS. Traditionally associated American Indian tribes and groups are invited to be a concurring party on the MOA.

## **FUTURE INFORMATION**

The *Mariposa Grove FEIS* is available on the Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website at (<http://www.parkplanning.nps.gov/mariposagrove>). To request printed documents or CDs, please e-mail ([yose\\_planning@nps.gov](mailto:yose_planning@nps.gov)) or call (209) 379-1202. A minimum 30-day no-action period will follow the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency noticing of the availability of the *Mariposa Grove FEIS* in the Federal Register. The NPS will prepare a Record of Decision (ROD) no sooner than 30 days after release of the FEIS. After approval of the ROD by the Regional Director, the park will announce the selected plan through local and regional press and on the project website. The official responsible for project implementation is the Superintendent, Yosemite National Park.

For further information, visit the park website at [www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/mgrove](http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/mgrove) or contact:

Superintendent  
ATTN: Mariposa Grove FEIS  
P.O. Box 577  
Yosemite National Park, CA 95389

## **LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND BUSINESSES RECEIVING THE RESTORATION OF THE MARIPOSA GROVE OF GIANT SEQUOIAS DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The following pages list the agencies, organizations, and businesses who received a hard copy or CD of the *Final EIS*.

### **U.S. Government**

#### **Legislature**

Members of Congress

#### **Federal Agencies**

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation  
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service

Bass Lake Ranger District  
Sierra National Forest

U.S. Department of Defense  
Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Board

U. S. Department of the Interior  
Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento Regional Office

National Park Service  
Pacific West Regional Office  
NPS Water Resources Division

U.S. Department of Justice  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, San Francisco Regional Office

#### **American Indian Tribes and Groups**

American Indian Council, Mariposa County  
Bishop Paiute Indian Council  
Bridgeport Paiute Indian Colony  
Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians  
Mono Lake Kutzadika'a Paiute Indian Community  
North Fork Mono Indian Museum  
North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians of California  
Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians  
Tuolumne Mewuk Rancheria  
Western Mono Tribal Government

### **County and Local Governments**

#### **Fish Camp**

Advisory Council  
Property Owners Association

#### **Madera County**

Board of Supervisors  
Planning Department

#### **Mariposa County**

Board of Supervisors  
Planning Department  
El Portal Town Planning Advisory Committee  
Wawona Town Planning Advisory Committee

#### **Merced County**

Board of Supervisors  
Planning Department

#### **Visitor Bureaus**

Bass Lake Chamber of Commerce, Bass Lake  
Coarsegold Chamber of Commerce, Coarsegold  
Eastern Madera County Chamber of Commerce  
Mariposa County Visitors Center (Chamber of Commerce), Mariposa  
Merced Visitor Services / California Welcome Center, Merced  
North Fork Chamber of Commerce, North Fork  
Oakhurst Area Chamber of Commerce, Oakhurst  
Yosemite Chamber of Commerce, Groveland  
Yosemite / Mariposa County Tourism Bureau, Mariposa  
Yosemite Sierra Visitors Bureau, Oakhurst

**California State Government**

**State Agencies and Organizations**

California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Region #4  
California Department of Transportation  
California State Clearinghouse  
California Office of Historic Preservation  
California Regional Water Quality Control  
Board #5F (Central Valley)

**Organizations and Businesses**

Backcountry Horsemen of California  
California Native Plant Society, Foothills  
Chapter  
California Native Plant Society, Sequoia  
Chapter  
Central Sierra Environmental Resource  
Center  
Delaware North Corporation  
Foothill Conservancy  
Friends of Yosemite  
High Sierra Hikers Association  
Mariposans for the Environment and  
Responsible Government  
National Audubon Society  
National Parks and Conservation  
Association  
National Trust for Historic Preservation  
Native Habitats  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
NatureBridge Yosemite  
Sierra Club  
Sierra Mono Museum  
The Redwoods in Yosemite  
Yosemite Conservancy  
Yosemite Restoration Trust

**Libraries**

Mariposa County Library, El Portal  
Mariposa County Library, Wawona  
Mariposa County Library, Mariposa  
Madera County, Library, Oakhurst

**Public Media**

**Newspapers**

Associated Press  
Fresno Bee  
Mariposa Gazette  
Merced Sun-Star  
Modesto Bee  
Mountain Democrat  
Oakland Tribune  
Sacramento Bee  
San Francisco Chronicle  
San Francisco Examiner

## LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS

Name	Responsibility	Education	Years of Experience
<b>NPS</b>			
Lisa Acree	Compliance Specialist	B.A. Environmental Studies	25 NPS
Teresa Austin	Administrative Officer; Chief, Division of Administration	M.B.A. Graduate Certificate/ Accounting B.S. Psychology	7 NPS
Barbara Bane	Project Archeologist	Registered Professional Archeologist M.A. Anthropology B.A. Art History	3 NPS 5 Other
Sue Beatty	Restoration Ecologist	Graduate Work in Natural Resources Management B.S. Recreation	25 NPS
Tony Brochini	Facilities Management	2 years undergraduate studies	34 NPS
Monica Buhler	Former Restoration Ecologist	B.A. International Studies and Global Resources	14 NPS
Sue Clark	Former Compliance Specialist	M.S. Environmental Policy/ Natural Resources Management B.S. Plant and Soil Science	31 NPS 6 Other
Lindsay Cline	Wildlife Biologist	M.S. Wildlife Management B.S. Biology	4 NPS 3 Other
Rebecca Cremeen	Outdoor Recreation Planner	M. City and Regional Planning B.A. Geography	1 NPS 14 Other
Jim Donovan	Project Manager	M. Urban and Regional Planning B.A. Fine Arts	12 NPS 15 Other
Randy Fong	Chief, Division of Project Management	M. Architecture B.A. Architecture	35 NPS 1 Other
Jennifer Hardin	Cultural Anthropologist; American Indian Liaison	Ph.D. Candidate— Sociocultural Anthropology M.A. Sociocultural Anthropology M.A. Applied Cultural Anthropology B.S. Sociocultural Anthropology	3 NPS 14 Other
Dave Henderson	Traffic Management Supervisor	A.S. Administration of Justice RCJTC Graduate—Police Science	11 NPS 22 Other
Karen Hockett	Social Scientist	Ph.D. Natural Resources Recreation M.S. Zoology B.S. Biology	1 NPS 8 Other
Kevin Killian	Chief Ranger, Division of Visitor and Resource Protection	B.S. Zoology	20 NPS
Kris Kirby	Chief, Division of Business and Revenue Management	M.S. Public Administration B.A. Political Science	17 NPS 4 Other

Name	Responsibility	Education	Years of Experience
Laura Kirn	Branch Chief in Anthropology and Acting Branch Chief in History, Architecture and Landscapes Program, Division of Resources Management and Science	M.A. Historic Preservation B.S. Anthropology	29 NPS
Kimball Koch	Acting Park Historic Preservation Officer	M. Landscape Architecture	24 NPS
Bill Kuhn	Terrestrial Ecologist/ Biogeographer	Ph.D. Ecology/Biogeography M.S. Ecology B.A. Biology	9 NPS
Linda Mazzu	Chief, Division of Resources Management and Science	M.S. Natural Resources Management B.S. Park and Recreation Management	20 NPS 10 Other
Jana Friesen McCabe	Visual Information Specialist	M.A. Luso-Brazilian Literature B.A. Latin American Studies	13 NPS
Kevin McCardle	Historical Landscape Architect	M. Landscape Architecture B.S. Microbiology B.S. Science Education	3 NPS 12 Other
Kathleen Morse	Chief, Division of Planning	Graduate Work in Coastal Zone Management B.S. Natural Resources Economics	2 NPS 20 USFS
Thomas R. Medema	Chief, Division of Interpretation and Education	M.S. Parks and Recreation Management B.S. Outdoor Recreation and Education	20 NPS
Bret Meldrum	Former Branch Chief, Visitor Use and Social Sciences	Ph.D. (ongoing) Natural Resources Studies M.S. Conservation Social Sciences B.S. Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Services	5 NPS 4 Other
Don Neubacher	Superintendent	M.S. Natural Resource Management B.S. Planning and Management	29 NPS
Marty Nielson	Special Assistant to the Superintendent	B.S. Outdoor Recreation	21 NPS 8 Other
Charles Repath	Former Restoration Ecologist	M.S. Land Resources and Environmental Sciences B.A. History	3 NPS 15 Other
Ann Roberts	Former NEPA Compliance Specialist	M.S. Forestry/Ecological Restoration B.S. Wildlife Management	5 NPS 6 USFS 5 Other
Jim Roche	Park Hydrologist	M.S. Geology B.S. Chemistry	14 NPS 3 Other

Name	Responsibility	Education	Years of Experience
Madelyn Ruffner	Acting Branch Chief in Planning and Compliance, Division of Project Management	M.P.P. Public Policy B.A. Environmental Studies	8 NPS 5 Other
Daniel Schaible	Former Historical Landscape Architect	B.A. Landscape Architecture	6 NPS
Eric Scott	Wawona District Ranger	B.S. Resource Recreation Management	26 NPS
Dean Shenk	Supervisory Park Ranger, Division of Interpretation	A.A. Fine Arts	35 NPS
Woody Smeck	Former Deputy Superintendent	M. Landscape Architecture	23 NPS 6 Other
Sarah Stock	Wildlife Biologist	M.S. Zoology B.S. Ecology	6 NPS 10 Other
Steve Thompson	Branch Chief in Wildlife Management, Division of Resources Management and Science	M.S. Ecology–Wildlife B.S. Biology	25 NPS 5 Other
Kim Tucker	Former Concessions Management Specialist; Division of Business and Revenue Management	Undergraduate studies (2 years)	36 NPS
Ed Walls	Chief, Division of Facilities Management	B.A. Microbiology	23 NPS
<b>Mithun</b>			
Brendan Connolly	Project Director, Architect	M. Architecture B.A. Architecture	15 Private
Susan Olmsted	Project Manager / Lead Designer, Architect, Landscape Architect	M. Architecture B. Landscape Architecture	2 Public 11 Private
Christian Runge	Landscape Designer	M. Landscape Architecture B.S. Biology	2 Private
<b>Independent Consultant (subcontractor to Mithun)</b>			
Robert A. York	Giant Sequoia Researcher	Ph.D. and M.S. Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management B.S. Forestry	2 Private 9 Public
<b>Sherwood Design Engineers (subcontractor to Mithun)</b>			
S. Bry Sarte	Principal Civil Engineer	B.S. Civil and Environmental Engineering B.A. Fine Arts	16 Private
Shauna Dunton	Civil Engineer	B.S. Civil and Environmental Engineering	12 Private
<b>Nelson   Nygaard (subcontractor to Mithun)</b>			
Michael Eiseman	Transportation Planner	B.A. Political Science	8 Private
Bonnie Nelson	Transportation Planner	B.S. Civil Engineering	30 Private
Cathleen Sullivan	Transportation Planner	M. City and Regional Planning	8 Private

Name	Responsibility	Education	Years of Experience
<b>URS Corporation</b>			
Keith Pohs	Former DEIS Project Manager, Writer-Editor,	M.S. Earth Science B.A. Geology	8 Private 6 Public
Jennifer Pyne	EIS Project Manager, Visitor Use and Experience	M.E.P. Environmental Planning B.A. Politics	13 Private 2 Public
Kinzie Gordon	Principal-in-Charge, Independent Technical Review	B.A. Anthropology	38 Private
Janis Offermann	Archaeology, Traditional Cultural Resources	M.A. Anthropology B.A. Anthropology	2 Private 35 Public
Jeremy Hollins	Historic structures	M.A. Public History B.A. History	9 Private
Melanie Lytle	Historic structures	M.A. Historic Preservation B.A. History	6 Private
Bonnie DeBerry	Hydrology and Water Quality	M.F.S. Aquatic Chemistry B.S. Natural Resources	13 Private 4 Public
Tim Rimpo	Air Quality	M.S. Economics B.A. Economics	28 Private
Ron Reeves	Soundscapes	B.S. Information Systems	21 Private
JP Charpentier	Vegetation, Wetlands, Special Status Species, and Wildlife	M.S. Wildlife Ecology	13 Private
Philip Mineart	Hydrology and Water Quality	M.S. Civil Engineering B.S. Environmental Resources Engineering	28 Private
David Konopka	Visitor Use and Experience	Graduate Studies in Landscape Architecture & Outdoor Recreation Planning B.S. Natural Resource Conservation	2 Private 12 Public
Allison Getty	Park Operations	M.A. Natural Resources/ Environmental Management B.S. Natural Resources/ Environmental Management	5 Private
Ryan McMullan	Soundscapes	B.A. Political Science B.A. Audio Arts and Acoustics	4 Private
John Qoyawayma	Graphics	Business Computing Systems	28 Private
Kathy Hinkel	Project Administrator	Business Certificate	8 Private
Meg Quarrie	Senior Word Processor	B.A. English	30 Private
<b>Climate Wise Solutions, LLC (subcontractor to URS)</b>			
Dr. George Koch	Technical Expert, Vegetation, Wetlands, Special Status Species, and Wildlife	Ph.D. Biology B.S. Biology	30 Academia, Research, and Consulting
<b>Independent Consultant (subcontractor to URS)</b>			
Dr. Steve Lawson	Technical Expert, Visitor Use and Experience	Ph.D. Natural Resources M.S. Resource Economics and Policy B.A. Political Science	10 Academia 4 Consulting

Name	Responsibility	Education	Years of Experience
<b>David Evans and Associates, Inc.</b>			
Perry Palmer	Landscape Architect	B. Landscape Architecture	20 Private
Jim Smith	Civil Engineer	B.S. Civil Engineering	30 Private
Kayla Pirotte	Civil Engineer	B.S. Civil Engineering	5 Private
Victor Vaskelis	Civil Engineer	B.S. Civil Engineering	12 Private
<b>Independent Consultant (subcontractor to DEA)</b>			
Brenda Ostrom	Project Facilitator	B.S. Geography M.T. Aeronautical Technology	4 Public 12 Private
<b>Independent Consultant (subcontractor to DEA)</b>			
Karen Braitmayer, FAIA	Accessible Design	B.S. Behavioral Science M.S. Architecture	18 Private
<b>Laugenour and Meikle (subcontractor to DEA)</b>			
Tom Horgan	Waste Water Management	B.S. Civil Engineering	41 Private
<b>Shannon &amp; Wilson, Inc. (subcontractor to DEA)</b>			
Michael Watari	Geotechnical	B.S. Civil Engineering M.S. Civil Engineering	13 Private 9 Public

